

# BACONIANA

FEBRUARY, 1933.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Shakespeare shows up the Earl of Oxford. By Henry Seymour - - - - -	97
The Missing Historical Plays of Shakespeare. By Howard Bridgewater - - - - -	106
Dressing Old Words New. By W. H. Denning - -	120
Pierre de Ronsard: A Vignette of History. By Alicia A. Leith - - - - -	130
Shakespeare and Bacon. By H. Kendra Baker - -	133
The English Renaissance. By M. F. Bayley - -	139
The First Baconian. By Lord Sydenham of Combe -	143
The Interrogatories of Francis Bacon - - - -	151
Report of Annual Dinner - - - - -	157
Reviews - - - - -	158
Correspondence - - - - -	162
Notes and Notices - - - - -	165
Obituary - - - - -	171

LONDON:

THE BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED

CANONBURY TOWER, N.1.



# BACONIANA

---

VOL. XXI, *Third Series*. FEB., 1933. No. 80

---

**It should be understood that "Baconiana" is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Bacon Society, but that the Society does not necessarily accept responsibility for opinions expressed by its contributors.**

---

## SHAKESPEARE SHOWS UP THE EARL OF OXFORD

IN

*ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL.*

*The principal characters of the Comedy Identified.*

BY HENRY SEYMOUR.

THE title, "All's well that ends well," is entered in Francis Bacon's private note-book (the *Promus*, fol. 103—circa 1594).\* The argument of the play is as follows. The heroine, *Helena*, daughter of a famous physician, *Gerard de Narbon* (deceased), is adopted and brought up by the *Countesse Dowager* of *Rossillion* as her own. She is passionately in love with the son of the Countesse, named *Bertram*, the young *Count of Rossillion*; and on being sent to Court, where her passion is discovered, she clearly perceives that her love is unreciprocated. She afterwards discovers that the *King of France* is troubled with a *fistula*, which, by a knowledge of her late father's prescription for that malady, she is certain to be able to

---

\* Harleian Collection (No. 7017).



## 98 Shakespeare and Earl of Oxford.

cure, notwithstanding that his case had been given up as entirely hopeless by his Court physicians. Her contriving manages to induce the King to try the remedy, which, in a short time, she practises, on the condition agreed that if the cure be effected, her reward shall be to choose one of the King's chief courtiers for a husband. The young *Count* of Rossillion is her aim, who has looked coldly upon her as beneath his station and dignity, but she conceals this from the King, trusting wholly to her ability to cure him and thereby to win the reward of securing, by the Royal Command, the husband of her desire. In a comparatively brief space, she effects the desired cure, much to the joy and satisfaction of the King; whereupon, true to his compact, he commands the young *Count* to take *Helena* for his wife. The *Count*, however, is sorely displeased and shews repugnance to wed by another's choice, but the King is imperative and obedience is commanded. The nuptials are thereafter celebrated, but, instead of going home with his wife, he deserts her and flies off to the wars in Tuscany; sending a letter to his wife by a friend to this effect,—that she should never call him her husband, till she should get the ring from his finger and shew him a child begotten by him of her body. Hearing this, *Helena* is distressed, but soon goes away privily in a pilgrim's habit and reaches Florence, there meeting with a widow whose daughter the young *Count* is endeavouring to debauch under a promise of faithful love. *Helena* discovers herself to the widow and daughter, who sympathetically enter into a plot to circumvent the *Count*. *Helena* induces the widow to encourage his advances, so that the daughter may procure the treasured ring from the *Count's* finger as an earnest of his professed fealty, and to arrange, at a suitable opportunity, to surrender herself to him in a disguise, whose place, in the bed, is to be supplied by no other than *Helena* herself. This artifice being effected, the *Count*, hearing the false news that *Helena* is dead, returns back to France; *Helena*, the widow and daughter secretly follow him thither, and they having proved his escapade before the King, the *Count* is con-

founded, after his lying attempts to deceive everyone, but can do nothing more than take his wife into favour, when the King forgives all that is past.

The story is taken almost entirely from Boccaccio, with slight but significant alterations. In the *Decameron* the heroine (daughter of the physician, *Gerard de Narbonne*) is called *Giletta* and the young Count is named *Beltram*. The disease of which the King suffers is not described as a fistula, but "a dangerous complaint which succeeded a swelling in his breast, from its not being well cured." The circumstance and condition of her cure of the King is the same, viz.: that if success attends her attempt to effect a complete restoration of health, she shall choose from the King's courtiers a husband. She cures the King and claims the *Count of Roussilon* as her reward. In much the same terms, the displeasure of *Beltram* is manifested, but he is commanded to marry *Giletta*, which he accordingly does, but only to go off at once to the Tuscan wars. Displeased with his desertion and neglect, *Giletta* sends two knights after him to learn if it is on her account that he forsakes his home, and promises that she will go elsewhere to pleasure him. His answer is precisely the same as that recited already. Being greatly afflicted at this, she considers what measures she may take to effect the two points regarding the ring and the child. She eventually resolves to go to Florence in the habit of a pilgrim, and having arrived at that place, she meets a widow, and her daughter to whom, it turns out, the *Count* was paying court; whereupon everything being discovered to them, they agreed, for a sum of money, to procure the ring from the *Count's* finger, in evidence of his good faith, before he could lie with her. This was accomplished, and soon after, *Giletta* herself was put to bed disguised as the widow's daughter, and two sons were the outcome of this exploit. The *Count* afterwards hearing that *Giletta* had departed out of his territories, goes thither at the request of his subjects. On learning that the *Count* is preparing a great feast at *Roussilon* on All Saints Day, *Giletta*, being now recovered, journeys thither in the same pilgrim's



## 100 Shakespeare and Earl of Oxford.

habit as when she at first set out, and appears at the feast with her two sons. Before the assembly she throws herself at her husband's feet, and pleads that he shall now abide by his two conditions, to wit, the ring in her possession, and not only one, but two sons of his own parentage. On the proofs being produced, the *Count* is dumb-founded, and being convinced of his wife's constancy and good management, puts aside his hatred, raises, and salutes her, making all honourable amends, when they live together happily ever after.

---

It has been said that "Shakespeare" displayed a poverty of resource in borrowing so largely the plots of his plays from other sources. It is seldom suspected that his motive in this may be assigned to deeper causes than a lack of the dramatic instinct. If, as I suggest, *All's Well* was written to hold up to immortal scorn that profligate courtier of Queen Elizabeth, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, without laying himself open to such a charge, then in adapting the earlier Italian story (which fitted, by a curious coincidence, the circumstances of Oxford's life), he exhibited much greater genius than if he had drawn out an entirely new plot. All that we have to do is to substitute England for France and metamorphise the French characters into the real *personel* of the English Court of the period, and the rest falls into its correct perspective. To the outer world the comedy was a mere episode of French life, but to those able to pierce the veil it was something very different.

There are anachronisms, of course, and confusion of detail, as is usual in most of Shakespeare's plays, as well as composite characterization, which is now being understood as part of the author's design. Thus we may vizualize that the French King, troubled with a *fistula*, points directly to Queen Elizabeth.

*Ros.*: What is it (my good Lord) the King languishes of?

*Laf.*: A Fistula my Lord.

*Ros.*: I heard not of it before.

*Laf.*: I would it were not notorious.

The Duke of Anjou told his associates that "he would

not marry the Queen of England, for she was not only an old creature, but had a sore leg." (Strickland). And Basil Brown, in *Law Sports at Gray's Inn*, says that "Queen Elizabeth had long suffered with a fistula in her leg."

The exigencies of dramatic construction may well excuse the anachronism of the widowed *Countesse*, who undoubtedly personified Burleigh's wife, Mildred, whilst Burleigh himself still played the rôle of chief Court Minister (Lord Lafew). That *Helena* stood for Anne Cecil, the youngest daughter of Burleigh, is perfectly obvious from her relations with *Bertram*, who represents Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, whose diabolical conduct with regard to her, after she became his wife, was notorious at the time. (Col. Hatfield MSS., Vol. II., p. 144).

Young Talbot, writing to his parents, says: "My Lo. of Oxforth is lately growne into great credite; for the Q.'Matie delitithe more in his parsonage, and his daunsigne, and valientnes, then any other: I think Sussex dothe back him all he can; if it were not for his fyckle hed he would passe any of them shortly. My Lady Burghley unwisely hathe declared herselfe, as it were, gelious, wch is come to the Quene's eare; whereat she hathe bene not a litell offended wth hir, but now she is reconciled agayne. At all theise love matters my Lo. Treasurer winketh, and will not meddle anyway."

Mrs. Aubrey Richardson writes: "The young Earl of Oxford—Burleigh's son-in-law—was a most distinguished libertine and coxcomb. . . . In 1581, the Earl, on whose counter attractions Lord Sussex had relied for the destruction of much of Leicester's authority, got into difficulties through his drunken and horribly dissolute habits, and was proceeded against by his wife, a daughter of Lord Burleigh. At the same time a quarrel flared up between Sussex and Leicester. The Queen ordered all three earls under arrest. A letter from Burleigh to Sir Christopher Hatton, thanking him for his good and honourable dealing with her Majesty in the case of my



## 102 Shakespeare and Earl of Oxford.

daughter of Oxford, commented upon the collision of the two elder peers. "I am sorry to hear of the disaster fallen out yesterday betwixt two great Planets; but I hear they know their Jupiter, and will obey her Majesty, rather to content her than to follow their own humours." Whatever their motives for making up, the antagonistic peers became, as on a former occasion, outwardly reconciled and were set free. Oxford was detained to be 'dealt with for his wife,\* and confronted with his accusers.' Sussex may have had some hope that the revelations of his *protégé's* articles of defence might do for the Favourite what his own attacks had never succeeded in accomplishing. But Sussex had never been blessed with real perspicuity, and in his judgments of Leicester and Oxford he mistook both men. Oxford was a thoroughly vicious person. Elizabeth and Hatton, even as Lord and Lady Burleigh and their unfortunate daughter, recognised this fact."

In the Italian story, the Countess has two children (both sons) and Lady Oxford also bore two children (a boy and a girl). The son died two days after birth, but the later daughter, Susan, grew up and became the wife of Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery in 1605. This earl was one of the patrons of the First Folio.

In Osborne's *Traditional Memoirs* a reference is made to the fickle and worthless affections of King James I. "But however remote his affections were, he durst not banish Ramsey the Court, a poor satisfaction for Philip (Herbert), that was left nothing to testifie his manhood but a beard and children *by that daughter of the last great Earl of Oxford, whose lady was brought to his Bed under the notion of his Mistress, and from such a virtuous deceit she is said to proceed.*"

Oxford's inhuman treatment of his wife is also mentioned by Lodge. "When the Duke of Norfolk, whom he (*Oxford*) entirely loved, was condemned, he applied to Lord Burleigh, whose daughter he had married, passionate-

---

\* Oxford married Anne Cecil when she was 15, the Queen herself being present.



ly beseeching him to interfere in the Duke's behalf; but his request being refused, he told Burleigh, with the greatest fury, that he would revenge himself by ruining the Countess: and he made his threat good; for from that hour he treated her with the most shocking brutality, and, having broke her heart, sold and dissipated the most part of his great fortune. He died 24 June, 1604."

Another side to the character of this landed scoundrel was his fantastical foppery.

Isaac Disraeli, in his "Curiosities," says that Edward de Vere was a person of elegant accomplishments, but that Lord Orford, in his 'Noble Authors,' has given a higher character of him than perhaps he may deserve. He was of the highest *rank*, in great favour with the Queen, and, in the style of the day, when all our fashions and our poetry were moulding themselves on the Italian model, he was the 'Mirrour of Tuscanismo,' and, in a word, this coxcombical peer, after a seven years' residence in *Florence*, returned highly 'Italianated.' The ludicrous motive of this perigrination is given in the present manuscript account. Haughty of his descent and alliance, irritable with effeminate delicacy and personal vanity, a little circumstance, almost too minute to be recorded, inflicted such an injury on his pride, that in his mind required years of absence from the Court of England ere it could be forgotten. Once making a low obeisance to the queen, before the whole court, this stately and *inflated* peer suffered a mischance, which has happened, it is said, on a like occasion—it was 'light as air'! But this accident so sensibly hurt his mawkish delicacy, and so humbled his aristocratic dignity, that he could not raise his eyes on his royal mistress. He resolved from that day to be 'a banished man,' and resided for seven years in Italy, living in more grandeur at Florence than the Grand Duke of Tuscany. He spent in those years forty thousand pounds. On his return he presented the queen with embroidered gloves and perfumes, then, for the first time introduced into England, as Stow has noticed. Part of the new presents seem to have some reference to the earl's

## 104 Shakespeare and Earl of Oxford.

former mischance. The queen received them graciously, and was even painted wearing these gloves; but my authority states, that the masculine sense of Elizabeth could not abstain from congratulating the noble coxcomb; perceiving, she said, that at length my lord had forgot the mentioning the little mischance of seven years ago."

Anne Cecil, Countess of Oxford, died June 6, 1588.

In the *Fugger Newes Letters*, "Oxford is again in the Tower for forgetting himself with one of the Queen's maids of honour, who is in the Tower likewise." This was Mistress Anne Vavasour. In a letter dated Jan. 19, 1585 from Thomas Vavasour, her brother, challenging Oxford to a duel, wrote—"If thy body had been as deformed as thy mind is dishonourable, my house had been yet unspotted, and thyself remained with thy cowardice unknown." From other sources we read that "the world never brought forth such a villainous monster . . . a beast in all respects, and in him no virtue to be found, and no vice wanting."

Arundel wrote of the "horrible enormities, great beastliness, detestable vices and impure life of this earl, and said that "to report at large all the vices of this monstrous earl were a labour without end," which could not be rebutted. "He has lost all credit and honour and has been abandoned by all his friends and by all the ladies of the Court. Finding himself alone and unsupported, he threw himself on his knees several times before the Queen."

In Wright's *History of Essex* it is said that the father of Lady Anne (Cecil) by stratagem contrived that her husband (Oxford) should unknowingly sleep with her, believing her to be another woman, and she bore a son to him in consequence of this meeting. Realizing that *Parolles* in the play is identified with Lord Burghley's son, Robert Cecil, I should incline to the opinion that Wright is wrong on that point. It was *Parolles* who was the "go-between" in this adulterous machination.

There is no doubt in my mind that the physician, *Gerard de Narbon*, stands for Dr. William Butts, who was

## Shakespeare and Earl of Oxford. 105

physician-in-Chief to Henry VIII. He married Margaret Bacon, of Cambridgeshire, and left three sons, Sir William of Thornage, Norfolk; Thomas, of Great Riburgh, Norfolk; and Edmund, of Barrow, Suffolk. The latter alone had issue, one daughter, who married Sir Nicholas Bacon, eldest son of Sir Nicholas, keeper of the great seal. One of their sons was Sir Nathaniel Bacon, the artist, who married Jane, Lady Cornwallis, widow of Sir Wm. Cornwallis, of Brome Hall. Anne, daughter of Sir Nathaniel and Lady Jane, became the wife of Sir Thomas Meautys, Bacon's secretary and friend.

From the foregoing we clearly see that all the principal characters in the play are relatives (near or distant) of Francis Bacon. This in itself amounts to strong presumptive evidence that Bacon was the author of the play.

To those who are familiar with Bacon's method of indicating names by numbers, it will be plain that my identification is borne out by this method of simple cypher. Can there be suggested any tangible reason why the author should follow the Italian model so closely in its setting, and yet go out of his way to change the unimportant names of the *persons*, unless for this express purpose of concealing names in numbers? Why should *Giletta* be changed to *Helena*? Why should *Beltram* be changed to *Bertram*? Possibly because the number in this name totals 67, which might be confounded with "Francis" (67). Why the change from *Gerard de Narbonne* to Gerard de Narbon? And why *Rousillon* to Rossillion.'?

The King of France (136)=Elizabeth, Regina.

"King" .. .. (39)=Fr. Bacon.

Bertram .. .. (73)=17 De Vere.

Rossillion.. .. (134)=Earl Oxforth.

Helena .. .. (43)=A. Cecill or Anne Cec'.

Lord Lafew .. .. (90)=L: Burleigh.

Coutesse .. .. (115)=Dame Burghley.

Gerard de Narbon (120)=Dr. W. Butts.

Parolles .. .. (92)=Sir R. Cecil.

The spelling of the names in the first column is taken from the *First Folio*, not from the distorted modern editions of the play.



## THE MISSING HISTORICAL PLAYS OF "SHAKESPEARE." .

HENRY III.—OR THE HONOURABLE HISTORY OF  
FRIAR BACON AND FRIAR BUNGAY.

By HOWARD BRIDGEWATER.

**B**Y way of introduction I should explain that some time ago I found myself wondering how it came about that from the sequence of the historical plays of "Shakespeare," beginning with John and ending with Henry VIII, there should be missing plays dealing with the reigns of the Edwards (I, II, III and IV) and Henry III. I could not satisfactorily account for the omission of plays dealing with the reigns of these kings on the ground that they were lacking in dramatic interest. Why, then, should the author jump from John to Richard II when Henry III and the reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III should intervene? It then occurred to me that possibly these kings' reigns had, in fact, been dramatised by the author, but were not included in the collected (folio) edition of his works, published in 1623, for the reason that they might be amongst his earliest works and excluded because they were not considered to be of sufficiently high standard to warrant inclusion therein, or for the reason that they might have been published under other names than that of "Shakespeare." I found that the latter explanation was the true one. A play had been written round the reigns of each of the Edwards, but each had appeared—except that of Edward III, which was anonymously published—as by a different author—Edward I as by Geo. Peele, Edward II as by Christopher Marlowe and Edward IV as by Thos. Heywood. In successive addresses to the Bacon Society I have shown that each of these plays was an early work of him who wrote the "Shakespeare" sequence of historical plays.

It took me some time to find the reign of Henry III, because there is, of course, no play so entitled. But I

found it eventually hidden, curiously enough, under the title of "The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay"—attributed to Robert Greene.

In my previous addresses, dealing with the Edwards, I was able to demonstrate that in every case one or other of the recognised critics of Elizabethan literature had remarked upon the Shakespearean quality of each of the plays devoted to the reigns of these kings, and may remind you that in the case of Edward II, attributed to Marlowe, that great authority, Mr. John H. Ingram, came so near to boldly declaring that it was, in fact, written by the same hand as that of him who wrote "Shakespeare" as to say that Marlowe's reflections in this drama are so Shakespearean in tone and temper that one is frequently prompted to think that he "must have been dipping his pen into the ink-horn of the young man from Warwickshire"! But, for some reason best known to himself, he escapes from the natural conclusion that is to be drawn from his own research by the aid of the inane suggestion that Marlowe had so completely "subjected" his mind and style to "Shakespeare's" that he could write in no other vein! It is an inspiring thought. We have apparently only sufficiently to study the art of Augustus John to be able to paint like him; to subject our minds to Rodin to become one of the world's greatest sculptors; to become a disciple of Sir Edwin Lutyens to be able to design the Cenotaph; to so admire Wagner as to be able to compose "Tannhauser," and so on.

Mr. Ingram does not appear, so far, to have written anything concerning the work attributed to Robert Greene, but if and when he does he will no doubt explain its Shakespearean character by the same means, for if Greene, in fact, wrote "The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay" he must have subjected his mind to "Shakespeare" with the same measure of success! as was achieved by Marlowe in the composition of Edward II.

Mr. C. F. Tucker Brooke, in his book entitled "The Shakespeare Apocrypha," says (in a reference to "Lochrine") that "There are few touches of purer pastoral

## 108 Missing Historical Plays.

feeling, even in "*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*," or the "*Arraignment of Paris*," than are found in "*Lochrine*." That reference sufficiently demonstrates the very high opinion he had formed of the literary value of the Play we are now to discuss, for "*Lochrine*" is by many critics thought to be a work of "Shakespeare."

The Play opens with the entrance of Edward Prince of Wales, son of King Henry III, in company with his courtiers. The Prince is described as being malcontented, and Lacy, one of the courtiers, speaking apart to the others, speculates upon the cause of his displeasure as follows:—

*Lacy.*           Why looks my lord like to a troubled sky  
When heaven's bright shine is covered with a fog?  
Alate we ran the deer, and through the lawns  
'Stripped with our nags the lofty frolic bucks  
That scudded 'fore the teasers like the wind.  
Ne'er was the deer of merry Fressingfield  
So lustily pulled down by jolly mates  
Nor shar'd the farmers such fat venison,  
So frankly dealt this hundred years before;  
Nor have I seen my lord so frolic in the chase,  
And now—chang'd to a melancholy dump.

Another courtier, Warren, continues the discussion thus:—

*Warren*       After the Prince got to the Keeper's Lodge,  
And had been jocund in the house awhile,  
Tossing off ale and milk in country cans,  
Whether it was the country's sweet content,  
Or else the bonny damsel fill'd us drink,  
That seem'd so stately in her stammel red,  
Or that a qualm did cross his stomach then—  
But straight he fell into his passions.

They approach the Prince and with difficulty, being at first repulsed, get into conversation. It soon transpires that he has become enamoured of the keeper's daughter and would somehow win her. Listen to this for his description of her:—

*Pr. Edward* I tell thee, Lacy, that her sparkling eyes,  
Do lighten forth sweet love's alluring fire;  
And in her tresses she doth fold the looks  
Of such as gaze upon her golden hair;  
Her bashful white, mix'd with the morning's red,  
Luna doth boast upon her lovely cheeks,  
Her front is beauty's table where she paints  
The glories of her gorgeous excellence;  
Her teeth are shelves of previous marguerites,



Richly enclosed with ruddy coral cliffs.  
Tush, Lacy, she is beauty's overmatch,  
If thou survey'st her curious imagery.

Lacy is made to question whether she really compares with the Court beauties, and this gives the opportunity for a second description, that "second heat upon the anvil" which is so characteristic of all "Shakespeare" plays. (And, as in the case of all the other Plays that are missing from the "Shakespeare" sequence, it will be observed that "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay" is written in blank verse.) The Prince continues:—

*Pr. Edward* Whenas she swept like Venus through the house,  
And in her shape fast folded up my thoughts,  
Into the milk-house went I with the maid,  
And there amongst the cream bowls she did shine,  
As Pallas 'mongst her princely huswifery.  
She turned her smock over her lily arms,  
And div'd them into milk to run her cheese,  
But whiter than the milk her crystal skin,  
Checked with azure, would have made *her* blush  
That art or nature durst bring for compare.

Being unable himself to pursue his amorous intentions but anxious to know if the girl was attracted to him, he arranges with his trusted friend, Lacy, to depute for him. To him he gives instruction as follows:—

*Pr. Edward* I am unknown, not taken for the prince;  
They only deem us frolic courtiers,  
That revel thus amongst our liege's game;  
Lacy, thou know'st next Friday is Saint James',  
And then the country flocks to Harleston fair;  
Then will the Keeper's daughter frolic there,  
And over-shine the troop of all the maids  
That come to see and to be seen that day.  
Haunt thee disguised amongst the country swains,  
Feign thou'rt a farmer's son not far from thence,  
Espy her loves and whom she liketh best;  
Cote him, and court her, to control the clown;  
Say that the courtier 'tired all in green,  
That helped her handsomely to run her cheese,  
And filled her father's lodge with venison,  
Commends him, and sends fairings to herself.  
Buy something worthy of her parentage,  
Not worth her beauty: for, Lacy, then the fair  
Affords no jewel fitting for the maid.  
And when thou talk'st of me, note if she blush:  
O then she loves: but if her cheeks wax pale,  
Disdain it is. Lacy, send how she fares,  
And spend no time nor cost to win her loves.

## 110 Missing Historical Plays.

I must tell you here that the scheme goes astray, so far as the Prince is concerned, for Lacy, though he does his best to carry out his mission faithfully, himself falls in love with and eventually marries the maid.

There are some beautiful love passages between the girl, Margaret, and Lacy, which unfortunately time precludes my citing, but I must give you the few lines in which Lacy answers the indignant Prince, who accuses him of betraying his trust.

*Lacy.* Truth all, my lord: and thus I make reply:  
At Harleston fair, there courting for your grace. . .  
Love taught me that your honour did but jest,  
That princes were in fancy but as men;  
How that the lovely maid of Fressingfield  
Was fitter to be Lacy's wedded wife  
Than concubine unto the Prince of Wales.

The Prince, nevertheless, is furious and threatens to kill him, but is stayed by Margaret who, in that event, says she will kill herself.

*Margaret.* Why think's King Henry's son that Margaret's love  
Hangs in th' uncertain balance of proud time?  
That death shall make a discord of our thoughts?  
No; stab the earl, and, 'fore the morning sun  
Shall vaunt him thrice over the lofty east,  
Margaret will meet her Lacy in the heavens.

Reconciliation is effected.

There are two main themes in this Play of Bacon and Friar Bungay. The first is the love episode with Margaret and the second a contest in the necromantic arts that is staged between Friar Bacon and one Vandermast, a German who comes to visit King Henry III in the train of the Emperor of Germany, the King of Castile, and his daughter, Elinor, whom it is apparently intended to match with Prince Edward.

King Henry explains that his son is at Oxford, disputing there (as he thinks) with the learned men, and proposes to have him brought to Court to meet his distinguished visitors, whereupon the Emperor interposes as follows:—

*Emp.* Nay rather Henry, let us, as we be,  
Ride for to visit Oxford with our train.  
Fain would I see your universities,  
And what learn'd men your academy yields.  
From Hapsburg have I brought a learned clerk,

To hold dispute with English orators.  
 This Doctor, surnam'd Jaques Vandermast,  
 A German born, passed into Padua,  
 To Florence and to fair Bologna,  
 To Paris, Rheims, and stately Orleans,  
 And, talking there with men of art, put down  
 The chiefest of them all in aphorisms,  
 In magic and the mathematic rules:  
 Now let us, Henry, try him in your schools.

I would draw your attention to the fact that the last two lines of this blank verse are made to rhyme. You are, of course, aware that this is a well-known characteristic of "Shakespeare." It would seem, therefore, either that the author of "Shakespeare" modelled his style on Robert Greene or himself wrote this work that is attributed to Greene.

Henry readily assents to this proposal and to Vandermast says:—

*Henry.* In Oxford shalt thou find a jolly friar  
 Called Friar Bacon, England's only flower;  
 Set him but nonplus in his magic spells,  
 And make him yield in mathematic rules,  
 And for thy glory I will bind thy brows  
 Not with a poet's garland made of bays  
 But with a coronet made of choicest gold.  
 Whilst then we set to Oxford with our troops,  
 Let's in and banquet in our English Court.

I should explain that Friar Bacon has already been introduced into the story, as, when the Prince goes on from his hunting to Oxford, three learned Doctors call upon the Friar, who it seems is but newly installed in Brazenose College. One of them, named Burden, addresses him thus:—

*Burden.* Bacon we hear, that long we have suspect,  
 That thou art read in magic's mystery:  
 In pyromancy, to divine by flames:  
 To tell, by hydromatic, ebbs and tides  
 By aeromancy to discover doubts,  
 To plain out questions as Apollo did.

*Bacon.* Well, Master Burden, what of all this?

*Burden.* I tell thee Bacon, Oxford makes report,  
 Nay' England, and the Court of Henry says,  
 Thou'rt making of a brazen head by art  
 Which shall unfold strange doubts and aphorisms,  
 And read a lecture in philosophy:  
 And by the help of devils and ghostly fiends,



## 112 Missing Historical Plays.

Thou mean'st ere many years or days be past,  
To compass England with a wall of brass.

*Bacon.* And what of this?

At first it would seem that they come to mock him, but when it appears that they come as friends, 'not grieving at his skill,' he unbends and says:—

*Bacon.* Resolve you doctors, Bacon can by books,  
Make storming Boreas thunder from his cave,  
And dim fair Luna to a dark eclipse.  
The great arch-ruler, potentate of Hell,  
Trembles when Bacon bids him or his fiends,  
Bow to the force of his pentagonon . . . .  
I have contrived and framed a head of brass  
(I made Belcephon hammer out the stuff)  
And that by art shall read philosophy:  
And I will strengthen England by my skill,  
That if ten Cæsars liv'd and reign'd in Rome,  
With all the legions Europe doth contain,  
They should not touch a grass of English ground.  
The work that Ninus rear'd at Babylon,  
The brazen walls fram'd by Semiramis,  
Carv'd out like to the portal of the sun,  
Shall not be such as rings the English strand,  
From Dover to the market place at Rye.

You will note the great wealth of mythological and ancient historical knowledge displayed in this verse. These statements of the Friar's appear to Burden, one of the Doctors, as boasts, and he rebukes him:—

*Burden.* But Bacon roves a bow beyond his reach  
And tells of more than magic can perform  
Thinking to get a fame by fooleries.  
Have I not passed as far in State of schools.  
And read of many secrets? Yet to think  
That heads of brass can utter any voice,  
Or more, to tell of deep philosophy—  
This is a fable Æsop had forgot.

This makes Bacon wrath and he exposes the fact that Master Burden's frequent visits to Henley are not, as he has led them to suppose, to a secret cell, there to spend the night in alchemy, but to visit the hostess of the Bell. This he proves by having her brought through the air at his summons—much to Burden's discomfiture.

But I must now come to the great contest of skill that takes place between Vandermast and Bacon. As a preliminary there is a bout between Vandermast and Friar Bungay, Bacon's collaborator.

Enter King Henry, the Emperor, the King of Castile, Elinor, Vandermast and Bungay.

The Emperor opens the proceedings by flattering Henry upon the situation of the town. He says:—

- Emp.* Trust me, Plantagenet, these Oxford schools  
Are richly seated near the river-side . . .  
The town gorgeous with high-built colleges,  
And scholars seemly in their grave attire,  
Learned in searching principles of art—  
What is thy judgment Jaques Vandermast?
- Van.* That lordly are the buildings of the town  
Spacious the rooms and full of pleasant walks;  
But for the doctors, how that they be learned,  
It may be meanly for aught I can hear.
- Bun.* But I tell thee German, Hapsburg holds none such  
None read so deep as Oxenford contains  
They are within our academic state,  
Men that can lecture it in Germany  
To all the doctors of your Belgic schools.
- King Hen.* Stand to him Bungay, charm this Vandermast  
And I will use thee as a royal king.
- Van.* Wherein darest thou dispute with me?
- Bun.* In what a doctor and a friar can.
- Van.* Before rich Europe's worthies put thou forth  
The doubtful question unto Vandermast.
- Bun.* Let it be this—Whether the spirits of pyromancy  
or geomancy be most predominant in magic?
- Van.* I say of pyromancy.
- Bun.* And I of geomancy.
- Van.* The cabalists that write of magic spells,  
As Hermes, Melchic and Pythagoras,  
Affirm that 'mongst the quaduplicity  
Of elemental essence, terra is but thought  
To be a punctum squared to the rest,  
And that the compass of ascending elements  
Exceed in bigness as they do in height . . .  
Then must these daemones that haunt that place  
Be every way superior to the rest.

Bungay will not have this. He says:—

I tell thee German, magic haunts the ground,  
And those strange necromantic spells  
That work such shows and wondering in the world  
Are acted by those geomantic spirits  
That Hermes called terrae filii.

Thus they go at it hammer and tongs (each displaying enormous erudition) until Vandermast puts the challenge:

But grant that geomancy hath most force:  
Bungay to please these mighty potentates,  
Prove by some instance what thy art can do.

The Emperor then interposes:—

Now English Harry, here begins the game:  
We shall see sport between these learned men.

*Van.* What wilt thou do?

*Bun.* Show thee the tree, leav'd with refined gold,  
Whereon the fearful dragon held his seat  
That watch't the garden call'd Hesperides,  
Subdued and won by conquering Hercules.

Bungay conjures and the tree appears, with the dragon shooting fire.

*King Hen.* What say you royal lordlings to my friar?  
Hath he not done a point of cunning skill.

Vandermast affects to think little of the performance. He says:—

*Van.* But as Alcmena's bastard raz'd this tree,  
So will I raise him up as when he lived,  
And cause him pull the dragon from his seat . . .  
And tear the branches piecemeal from the root .  
Hercules! prodi, prodi, Hercules!

*Hercules appears in his lion's skin.*

*Her.* Quis me vult?

Vandermast tells him to

"Pull off the sprigs from off the Hesperian tree,  
As once thou did'st to win the golden fruit."

Hercules begins to break the branches and Vandermast turning triumphantly to Bungay, says.

"Now Bungay, if thou can'st by magic charm  
                the fiend."

From pulling down the branches of the tree.  
Then art thou worthy to be counted learned."

To the dismay of his partisans Bungay replies "I cannot"! and Vandermast in triumph exclaims:—

*Van.* Cease Hercules, until I give thee charge——.  
Mighty commander of this English isle. . .  
Bungay is learn'd enough to be a friar,  
But to compare with Jaques Vandermast,  
Oxford and Cambridge must go seek their cells  
To find a man to match him in his arts.  
I have given non-plus to the Paduans,  
To them of Sien, Florence and Bologna,  
Rheims, Louvain and fair Rotterdam,  
Frankfort, Lutetia and Orleans:  
And now must Henry, if he do me right,  
Crown me with laurel, as they all have done.



Enter Bacon.

*Bacon.* "All hail to this royal Company  
That sit to hear and see this strange dispute!  
Bungay, how stand'st thou as a man amaz'd  
What, hath the German acted more than thou?"

*Van.* "What art thou that question thus?"

*Bacon.* "Men call me Bacon."

*Van.* "Lordly thou look'st as if thou wert learn'd;  
Thy countenance as if science held her seat  
Between the circled archers of thy brows."

In reply to Bacon's question as to what has happened so far, Vandermast tells him that he has "Rais'd Hercules to ruinate that tree that Bungay mounted by his magic spells.

*Bacon.* "Set Hercules to work."

*Van.* "Now Hercules I charge thee to thy task;  
Pull off the golden branches from the root."

*Her.* "I dare not. See'st thou not great Bacon here,  
Whose frown doth act more than thy magic can?"

*Van.* By all the thrones and dominations,  
Virtues, powers and mighty hierarchies,  
I charge thee to obey to Vandermast.

*Her.* "Bacon, that bridles headstrong Belcephon,  
And rules Asmenoth, guider of the north,  
Binds me from yielding unto Vandermast.

*King Hen.* How now Vandermast? Have you met with your  
match? . . .

*Emp.* Why, Vandermast, art then overcome?—  
Bacon dispute with him and try his skill.

*Bacon.* . . . I came to have your royalties to dine,  
With Friar Bacon here in Brazen-nose.  
And for this German troubles but the place,  
And holds his audience with a long suspense,  
I'll send him to his academy hence.——  
Thou Hercules, whom Vandermast did'st raise,  
Transport the German unto Hapsburg straight,  
That he may learn by travail, 'gainst the spring,  
More secret dooms and aphorisms of art,  
Vanish the tree and thou away with him!

*Exit the spirit of Hercules with Vandermast and the tree.*

You will note the lordly, the imperious, part that is assigned to Friar Bacon; how, as to the manner born, he holds himself the intellectual peer of all with whom he comes in contact. In the light of what is known of the alleged author, Robert Greene, I shall ask you to consider whether he, or any writer, other than a familiar of the  
∞ Court, is at all likely to have been capable of so familiarly

## 116 Missing Historical Plays.

presenting these royal personages to our notice. But if the real name of the young intellectual who had imposed upon himself the task of writing a series of plays dealing in dramatic form with the kings of England should happen to have been Francis Bacon, I can well understand that he might not have been averse to figuring himself, thus thinly disguised, in the leading part.

As is the case with several other of the "Shakespeare" Plays, this so curiously entitled play concludes with the characters being led away to a banquet. But it has another and extremely interesting characteristic in that it ends, as does Henry VIII, with a remarkable panegyric of Queen Elizabeth.

The introduction to this last scene is in itself (if I may so describe it) so regally informed that I cannot refrain from quoting it, as follows:—

Enter the Emperor with a pointless sword; next the King of Castile carrying a sword with a point; Lacy carrying the globe; Prince Edward; Warren carrying a rod of gold with a dove on it; Ermsby with a crown and sceptre; the Queen (Princess Elinor) with the Fair Maid of Fressingfield on her left hand; King Henry; Bacon; with other Lords attending."

Following some very gracefully worded complimentary speeches, the King, referring to the marriage of the Prince with the Princess Elinor (which is now an accomplished fact), says:—

Seeing the marriage now is solemnised,  
Let's march in triumph to the royal feast . . .  
But why stands Friar Bacon here so mute?

Now listen to this and compare it, as you listen, with that wonderful prophesy of Archbishop Cranmer at the baptism of Elizabeth:—

*Bacon.* Repentant for the follies of my youth,  
That magic's secret mysteries misled,  
And joyful that this royal marriage,  
Portends such bliss unto this matchless realm.

*King Hen.* Why, Bacon,  
What strange event shall happen to this land?  
Or what shall grow from Edward and his queen?

*Bacon.* I find by deep prescience of mine art,  
Which once I temper'd in my secret cell,  
That here where Brute did build his Troynovant.  
From forth the royal garden of a king

Shall flourish out so rich and fair a bud  
 Whose brightness shall deface proud Phoebus' flower  
 And over-shadow Albion with her leaves.  
 Till then Mars shall be master of the field,  
 But then the stormy threats of wars shall cease;  
 The horse shall stamp as careless of the pike;  
 Drums shall be turn'd to timbrels of delight.  
 With wealthy favours plenty shall enrich,  
 The strand that gladdened wandring Brute to see.  
 And peace from heaven shall harbour in these  
 leaves.

That gorgeous beautifies this matchless flower.  
 Apollo's heliotropian then shall stoop  
 And Venus' hyacinth shall vail her top;  
 Juno shall shut her gillyflowers up,  
 And Pallas' bay shall 'bash her brightest green;  
 Ceres' carnation, in consort with those  
 Shall stoop and wonder at Diana's rose

You will note this further example of the Shakespearean rhyming of the last two lines of a climatic piece.

*King Hen. replies:*

This prophesy is mystical . . .  
 (and with a little more discussion of it, brings the scene and  
 the play to a close with)

Let's march: the tables all are spread,  
 And viands such as England's wealth affords,  
 Are ready set to furnish out the boards.

Now about Robert Greene, the supposed author of this wonderful work. He is stated to have been born in Norwich, probably about 1560. I find that it is merely conjectured that he was born at Norwich, but as he must have been born somewhere that does not much matter, though I object strongly to the manner in which pure conjecture is often put forward as fact. He is supposed to have entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1575, graduated B.A. in 1578 and taken his M.A. at Clare Hall, Cambridge, in 1583, though why one should take his B.A. at one college and his M.A. at another it is difficult to understand. What happened, I think, is this: Greene described himself on the title page of certain works as, respectively, B.A. and M.A. It is, therefore, assumed that he was, in fact, entitled to those degrees. Investigators have, however, great difficulty in proving this and can only do so, to their satisfaction, if not to mine, by going from College to College trying to find someone of the



## 118 Missing Historical Plays.

name of Robert Greene, who actually was granted the degree in question about the time they want to find it! That certainly was the method adopted in the case of Marlowe, and, as you know, the investigators in that case were quite satisfied to recognise as Christopher Marlowe the Chros. Marlin who was found at Bennet's College to have taken the required degree at about the requisite time! It is in that manner, as you know, that the lives of the believed-to-exist galaxy of Elizabethan dramatists have been reconstructed. "By his own account," says Prof. Allan Neilson, of the Harvard University, "he (Greene) lived up to the proverbial reputation of the Italianate Englishman," being supposed to have travelled in Spain and Italy. . He is supposed to have returned to England (though there is no proof at all that he ever left it) and to have busied himself in the production of that mass of romances, tracts, songs and plays which, according to Prof. Neilson, "give him his place in literature." My study of the facts leads me, however, to the conclusion that his place in literature is hypothetical, except in so far as the tracts and ballads are concerned and some of the very inferior plays that bear his name. One of these plays is entitled the "History of Alphonsus, King of Arragon." Its general style reminds one of those dreadful verses that are commonly recited at provincial Pantomimes by the fairy queen, with a view to filling in time while the stage hands are busy preparing the next scene. I must give you one example of its quality. Belinus, a noble, is in revolt against Arragon. He is made to address other lords in his train as follows:—

*Belinus.*      Thus far, my lords, we trained have our camp  
 For to encounter haughty Arragon,  
 Who with a mighty power of straggling mates,  
 Hath traitorously assailed this our land,  
 And burning towns and sacking cities fair,  
 Doth play the devil wheresomever he comes.  
 Now, as we are informed of our scouts,  
 He marcheth on unto our chiefest seat . .  
 For to begirt it with his bands about.  
 And so at length, the which High Jove forbid,  
 To sack the same as er'st he other did . .  
 Wherefor your sovereign thinketh it most meet

To prevent the fury of the foe,  
 And Naples succour, that distressed town,  
 By entering in ere Arragon doth come,  
 With all our men, which will sufficient be,  
 For to withstand their cruel battery."

In or about 1585 Greene is supposed to have married a Lincolnshire woman, who bore him a son. He deserted her after spending her portion. "The annals of literature" says Prof. Neilson, "hardly bear the record of a more sordid career."

In conclusion, I would draw your attention to the fact that whereas Greene died in 1592 the first edition of "The Hon. History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay" is dated 1594. This significant fact, in my humble view, strongly supports the internal evidence afforded by the play itself that this wonderful production was published as by him (when he was no longer alive to deny it) in order to conceal its true authorship. Henry III., under the title of *The Hon. History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, being now accounted for, my work of finding the Missing Historical Plays of "Shakespeare" has now, to your satisfaction, I trust, been completed.

---

"The actual data for an article on the Life of Shakespeare could be written on a postcard if anybody knew them and had a postcard. We know that he lived, and that he was popularly supposed to have been the author of Shakespeare's works. As this point is very moot I shall leave it severely alone. Were it not for the brilliantly imaginative historical novel on the subject by Sir Sidney Lee we should have little to go upon but supposition. After Sir Sidney Lee we have nothing but supposition to go upon . . . His later days seem to have been preoccupied entirely with the problem of making his will. To this he appears to have devoted considerable trouble, even, as the experts affirm, signing it in three different handwritings, each of them quite illegible."—*Mr. Alan Bland in "The Theatre World,"* April, 1932.

## DRESSING OLD WORDS NEW.

By W. H. DENNING.

A study of the sonnets, *Lucrece*, and the not so very "doubtful" *Edward III*, has convinced me that their author had some fantastic method of composition, or "aid to invention." It seems that he would run his eye up and down a page of pen or print to form new images in his mind; or, it is much the same thing, he would jot down words and phrases from some external matter and then build them, or anything suggested by them, into a new structure. I do not mean occasional references to Holinshed for history and the like, but a more subtle kind of alchemy. There is often a fitting of thought to words instead of words to thought, and by the association of words re-used one is led to the source of his inspiration.

While a few of the sonnets savour of such comparatively early matter as *Lucrece*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *Edward III*, an infinitely larger number of lines seem to have been prompted by lines in *Titus Andronicus* of all plays! Some sonnets are compounds of this and that. (See sonnet 76).

In support of these assertions, many pages of parallels or plagiarisms—call them what you will—could be given, but as space will not permit, and there is little point in comparing "Shakespeare" with "Shakespeare," I give but one example which supports my contention that it was not a case of memory but some mechanical method of composition.

	A great tumult (political)	thrallèd discontent
L. 119	child	child
122	chief architect	
123	house	buildèd
124	to witness	witness call
143	that misbelieving Moor	that heretic
144	death	die for goodness



145	for his most wicked life	lived for crime
151	stand all aloof	all alone stands
161	melt in showers—Titus	drowns with showers. <i>Son.</i> 124.
	And. V.3.	
127	more than any living	
	man could bear	Were it <i>ought</i> to me
129	<i>ought</i>	I bore the canopy
134	mutual	mutual
152	obsequious	obsequious
158	that I should pay—	paying too much— <i>Son.</i> 125.
	<i>Ibid.</i>	

Since compiling these notes, I have noticed in *Notes and Queries* (24-9-32) that Mr. Archibald Stalker, writing from the orthodox point of view, tells us how he discerns in the sonnets another hand beside Shakespeare's. Of this alien pen he says: "*His verse is manufactured—one bit put on another, and each bit a mechanical addition.*" Now this, I believe, is true of the sonnets generally; it is what I am trying to say and to illustrate; and expressed in that manner, it will go far to support anything herein which might otherwise be thought somewhat extravagant.

It occurred to me that if the poet would tear a play to pieces in such a manner, so he would his correspondence; and as the poet says in sonnets 37 and 89 that he was lame, Anthony Bacon's correspondence would be the matter to investigate. Many letters to him from his mother are given in full in Hepworth Dixon's *Personal History of Lord Bacon*, and what I found in regard to three or four of them is quite consistent with the poet's method.

The comparisons following are set out shorn of much irrelevant matter, and what is most important, generally regardless of any meaning the poet intended to convey. The pages refer to the *Personal History*, 1861 edition.

On page 313 is a letter from Lady Bacon, dated Sept. 7th, 1594. In this letter the good lady tells Anthony of a certain "start up glorious stranger" who, although he had cured no one previously, would now cure my Lord Treasurer's gout. The stranger was told to go away and cure first, then come again.

The poet would visualise the scene with the quack going away peeved because the Lord Treasurer would not take his advice. This idea is built into a sonnet together with two

## 122 Dressing Old Words New.

or three similar words used by Lady Bacon in the same breath: "I will *desire* Mistress Morer to be with me here for that time. If you *prove* your new in hand *physic*."

. . . . . the physician. . . . .  
*Angry that his prescriptions are not kept*  
*Hath left me, and I desperate now approve,*  
*Desire is death, which physic did except.—Son. 147.*

"Lately young Morer was smote in the eye . . . . *But my sons have no judgment.*"

. . . . . O, how can Love's eye be true  
 That is so vexed—  
 Or, if they have, *where is my judgment fled?*—Son. 148.

Much of this may appear frivolous and puerile, but we are dealing with the "nimble thought" of an extraordinary—I may say abnormal—person; and as there seems no precedent for anything quite of this nature, I ask some indulgence. Were the points of contact less hazy they would have been exposed long ago.

The next is matter in a letter dated Oct. 8th, or 18th, 1593, to Anthony (p. 311) compared with lines in three or four consecutive sonnets. To my mind it is conclusive evidence that the sonnets are from the house of Bacon. Lady Bacon, mourning the loss of Goodman Finch, says:

"Surely son one cannot value rightly the singular benefit of such a one in these dissolute and unfaithful days."

O, him she stores, to show what wealth she had,  
 In days long since, before these last so bad.—Son. 67.

"I pray God keep you safe from all *infection* of sin and plague."  
 Ah! wherefore with *infection* should he live,  
 And with his presence grace impiety,  
 That *sin* by him.—*Ibid.*

Lady Bacon, referring to Finch, says:

"I am so sorry for HIS DEATH AS I cannot choose but mourn my great loss thereby and now in my *weakish sickly age*."

This thought is AS A DEATH, which cannot choose  
 But weep to have that which it fears to lose.—Son. 64.  
 The rich-proud cost of *outworn buried age*.—*Ibid.*, line 2.

There are a few minor points: Lady Bacon uses the expression "posting in jollity"; Sonnet 66, "trimm'd in jollity." ("Jollity" occurs but six times in "Shakespeare").

"But now he is gone."

Tired with all these, from these would I be gone.—Son. 66.

It is highly probable that this letter accounts for the extreme pessimism at this spot. The sad mother informs Anthony of the death by the dread "sickness" prevailing at the time, of two near and "very necessary persons to me, a widow," etc.

The following passages compared with lines from *Edward III.* are from the same letter:

"but the Lord God doth it . . . to teach them to draw nearer to Him." "you shall be better esteemed both by wise and unwise before that puniens *experientia docebit* tuo imp."\* "much quiet of mind . . . to spend my time."

Queen: And kings approach the nearest unto God—l. 41.  
Is held in *reputation* none of ours.—l. 46.

K. Edw.: Although *experience teach* us this is true,  
That *peaceful quietness* brings most delight.—V.1.

"Promise not rashly be *tui juris*." "peradventure pot-fellowship companions."

K. Edw.: My promise? well, I do confess as much:  
But I required the chiefest citizens—  
You *peradventure* are but *servile grooms*—  
Whom, apprehended, law would execute, etc.—*Ibid.*

Lady Bacon says that Anthony's awful companions have pleasing and *boasting* speeches, and King Edward decides that the "servile grooms" shall live to *boast* of clemency.

Lady Bacon's "jollity" (again) and "peradventure" take us to a passage or two in *Edward III.* where they are found with other points of contact, all within nineteen lines:

"before that puniens *experientia docebit* tuo imp."  
CONTENT thee man, they are far enough from hence;  
And will be met, I warrant ye, *to their cost*,  
Before they break so far into the realm.—III.2.

"leisure to spend my time." "posting in jollity." "towards winter." "ne te sero peniteat."† "peradventure."  
I, so the grasshopper doth *spend the time*  
In *mirthful jollity*, till winter come;  
And then too late he would *redeem his time*—  
May, *peradventure*, for his negligence.—*Ibid.*

"Look well to your house and servants."  
We that have charge and *such a train as this*  
Must *look in time* to look for them and us.—*Ibid.*

---

\* before that punitive experience shall teach you to your cost.

† lest you too late repent.



## 124 Dressing Old Words New.

"*Fear* late and night roads now towards winter. *Your sad mother.*"  
 We cannot tell, 'tis good to *fear the worst*.  
 Yet rather fight, than like unnatural sons  
 Forsake *your loving parents in distress*.—*Ibid*.

It may, or it may not have been observed how abruptly "mother" in sonnet 8 becomes "widow" in sonnet 9. In the latter we have the same "Fear" and "toward." As far as I can see it is the only sonnet influenced throughout by Lady Bacon, and it is a good example of the way in which the poet would build up a sonnet. Lady Bacon's phrases are found in the same letter in the order following:

*Lady Bacon:*  
 put me in remembrance—  
 me a widow—  
 to lament daily—  
 quiet of *mind* and  
 leisure to *spend*—  
 public and *private*—  
 unthrifths—  
*Fear* late . . . roads  
 now *towards* winter.

*Sonnet 9:*  
 her husband's shape in mind,  
 widow  
 and still weep—  
*mind*—  
*spend*—  
 every *private* widow—  
 unthrift—  
 Is it for *fear*—  
 No love *toward* others.

It was not a compliment to the mother if the author, when augmenting an existing *Hamlet*, referred to her for rambling matter for Ophelia at the Court. These extracts are from a letter to Anthony, dated May 29th, 1592 (p. 308).

*Lady Bacon: It was not well*  
*it was so soon seen at court*  
*to make talk. . . . .*  
*. . . . .*

*Tell your brother I counsel*  
*you to send it no more.*  
*What had my Lady S . . . (?)*  
*to borrow your coach?*

*Ophelia: I hope all will be well.*  
 We must be patient, but I cannot choose but weep, to think they should lay him i' the cold ground.  
*My brother shall know of it; so I*  
*thank you for your good counsel.*  
 Come, my *coach*! Goodnight ladies; goodnight, sweet ladies.  
 —IV.5.

"Sweet" an addition to ladies in the later play, probably answers Lady Bacon's query.

The following lines are within thirty in the "doubtful" play *The Birth of Merlin*, Act III., Sc. 2. The first known edition of this play is dated 1662, but the names of the authors are given as *William Shakespear* and William Rowley. The quotations are from a letter dated July 30th, 1595, to Anthony (p. 325). In this Lady Bacon complains of her reduced circumstances:

"set aside my poor mortmain (inalienable estate) but £200 . . . for my continuance."

The Hermit says to Modestia:

Thou shalt but lose the wealth thou could'st not keep.

"I gave your brother at twice £25 for his *paling* . . . he taketh still inward *grief*."

*Edwin*: Think of your father's tears, your weeping friends,  
Whom cruel *grief* makes *pale* and bloodless for you.

"to discern how to walk in their worldly vocation to please God."  
"the justices have bound Bun to good *a-bearing* till next sessions."

*Modestia*: The contemplation of a happy death,  
Which is to me so *pleasing* that I think  
No torture could divert me: *what's this world*,  
*Wherein you'd have me walk* . . .  
We are but bail'd upon our good *a-bearing*  
Till that great sessions.—

"My Lord Chief Baron's marriage with your sister."

*Edwin*: This sounds the marriage of your beauteous sister.

The last paragraph of the letter says:

"My Lord Chief Baron's marriage with your sister I never any inkling of before Crosby told. I *pray* at your leisure write to me some circumstance of the manner and *God bless it*."

*Hermit*: My Lord, I do not, nor to cease, to love ye;  
I only *pray*, her faith may fixed stand,  
*Marriage was blest*, I know, with heaven's own hand.

How extraordinary it is, that while both speak of a marriage of a sister and other things, both use an ordinary but striking legal expression not to be found in the authentic works of Shakespeare, the lawyer!

The following passages are in a letter to Anthony (p. 310), dated June 26th, 1593, and a group of sonnets:

"Your careful mother." . . . being full of care.—Son. 56.

"Goodman Grinnell of Barly came this morning . . . sad upon a speech . . . you were about to let his farm to another."

Let this sad interim like the ocean be  
Which parts the shore, where two contracted-new (anew)  
Come daily to the banks.—*Ibid*.

The thought behind lines 9-12 seems to be that Anthony had relented and come to a new agreement with Grinnell in accordance with Lady Bacon's wishes. She says: "I pray you comfort Grinnell's heart"—let him continue at

## 126 Dressing Old Words New.

Barly, "and so the Lord *bless* you"—presumably for so doing. The poet continues:

. . . . that, when they (the contracting parties) see  
Return of love, more *blessed* may be the view.—*Ibid.*  
"Mowing and other businesses come on; it is here marvellously hot  
and dry and grass burnt away."  
And nothing stands (but) for his scythe to *mow*.—*Son.* 60.  
"yet hopeth better."  
And yet, to times in hope.—*Ibid.*  
"Be not too open, Sit not up late."  
Is it thy will, thy image should keep open  
My heavy eyelids to the weary night.—*Son.* 61.  
"you may have health to do good service when God shall appoint."  
Nor services to do till you require—*Son.* 57.  
"I *think* once upon a sale of wood in your *absence*."  
Nor *think* the bitterness of *absence* sour,  
When you have bid your servant *once* adieu.—*Ibid.*

The last comparison calls to mind a spot of *Edward III.* closely related to this group of sonnets. The quotation is from the same letter:

"the receipt of some money upon it . . . Good son . . . be not suddenly removed nor believe hastily, but *know whom and how*."

K. *Edw.*: And for recompense, beside this *good*,  
Thou shalt receive five hundred markes in *gold*.—  
I know not *how* we should have met our son;  
Whom now in heart I wish I might behold.—III. 3.

A few passages in six consecutive sonnets are here compared with a letter dated May 24th, 1592, from Lady Bacon to Anthony (p. 32).

"touching your coach . . . it was not wisdom to have it seen."  
If eyes, corrupt by over-partial looks  
Be anchored in the *bay* where all men *ride*,  
Why of eyes' falsehood hast thou *forged hooks*.—*Son.* 137.

Regardless of meaning, "coach" might have suggested three things: "riding," the "bay" (or bays), and there would be one pair of "forged hooks" upon it at least.

"they will all seek to abuse your want of experience."  
That she might think me some untutored youth,  
Unlearned in the world's false subtleties.(1609).—*Son.* 138.  
"my going is almost spent."  
. . . . my days are past the best.—*Ibid.*

"You were best to excuse you by me."  
Let me excuse thee: ah!—*Son.* 139.



"It was not *wisdom* to have it seen . . . you shall be so much *pressed* to *lend* . . . I would your *health* had been such . . . *my going is almost spent*." (In eight printed lines).

Be *wise* as thou art cruel; do not *press*  
My tongue-tied patience with too much disdain;  
Lest sorrow *lend* me words—  
No news but *health* from their physicians know—  
As testy sick men, *when their deaths be near*.—Son. 140.

"Likewise young C. may sue to be your man . . . you shall find such young men proud and bold and of no service."

Dissuade one foolish heart from serving thee,  
Who leaves unswayed the likeness of a man,  
Thy proud heart's slave and vassal wretch to be.—Son. 141

"the father . . . hath forfeited his bond."

And sealed false bonds.—Son. 142.

"understand well first *your own state*."

O, but with mine compare thou *thine own state*.—*Ibid*.

Lady Bacon to Anthony Bacon, June 26th, 1593:

"I pray you *comfort* Grinnell's heart . . . be not too frank with that Papist; such have *seducing spirits* to snare the godly . . . *Your careful mother*." (p. 310).

Two loves I have of *comfort* and despair,  
Which like two *spirits* do suggest (*tempt*) me still.—Son. 144.  
Lo, as a *careful housewife* runs to catch.—Son. 143.

\* \* \* \* \*

Spedding prints a letter written in Oct., 1593, by the Earl of Essex to Anthony, which seems to be behind lines in one or two individual sonnets and two related groups. One phrase used by the Earl in this rather long letter is: "the world would teach it me," and he concludes thus: "I am full of pain. . . I wish to you as to myself." Three consecutive sonnets conclude thus:

And that thou teachest—(39).  
The pain be mine—(38).  
Look what is best, that best I wish in thee—(37).

"Whereupon she bade me *name* any man of *worth* whom they had not named. I named Mr. Morris and *gave him his due*. She . . . said his speaking against her in such a *manner*—"

O, how thy *worth* with *manners* may I sing—  
And our dear love lose *name* of single one,  
That by this separation I may *give*  
*That due to thee*.—Son. 39.

On the way to No. 96 which is related to No. 36—it has the same concluding couplet—we must pause at No. 74, where we find "his due" again.

## 128 Dressing Old Words New.

"The queen sorrowed for your sickness which arrested you by the way. . . . She was content to hear me plead." "I named Mr. Morris and gave him his due."

But be contented: when that fell arrest

Without all bail shall carry me away—

The earth can have but earth, which is his due—*Son.* 74.

This letter was written when the Earl was pestering the queen for a place for Francis Bacon. He quotes her Majesty's words: "the sole exception against Mr. Cooke was stronger against *your brother which was youth*." As sonnet 96 begins

*Some say, thy fault is youth,*

it could be that Francis Bacon was the person addressed, with the idea of her Majesty's service in prospect behind the lines:

. . . . on the finger of a thronèd queen

The basest jewel will be well esteemed.—*Son.* 96.

At all events, there is an echo of the then thronèd queen's expressed opinion of Francis Bacon. Whoever is prepared to dissent must also be prepared to say why "queen," which occurs but once in the whole of the sonnets, must needs happen in this one!

Passing on to the next group—it is not far—we have three or four obviously related to Nos. 38 and 40; No. 103 is practically a duplicate of No. 38.

The Earl says, in the matter of Mr. Bacon:

"If I lacked judgment to discern between the worth of one man and another *the world would teach it me*."

. . . . I teach thee how

To make him seem long hence as he shows now.—*Son.* 101.

"To the first I answered." Make answer muse.—*Ibid.*

"I am full of pain and can write no more."

O, blame me not if I no more can write!—*Son.* 103.

Mr. Bacon's worth, etc., "hath been as violently urged this day as ever was anything"; the result was, as in the case of the poet:

To mar the subject that before was well.—*Ibid.*

"there was such a *difference* in the worthiness of the persons."

Therefore my verse, to constancy confined,

One thing expressing, *leaves out difference*.\*—*Son.* 105.

---

\* "difference" occurs but this once in the sonnets.

The Earl says a few lines on: "those whom she trusted did *leave out* . . . the worthiest."

"*my mingling of arguments of merit with arguments of affection—*"

Fair, kind, and true, is all my argument—*Ibid.*

"If they were of one standing. . . Mr. Bacon was the *ancient in standing by three or four years.*"

. . . still doth stand . . . three summers . . . three winters, etc.

—*Son.* 104.

In a six line letter to Francis Bacon, we find: "I . . . will take the first *opportunity* I can to move your suit . . . your most assured *friend*, Essex."

When wilt thou (Opportunity) be the humble suppliant's *friend*,  
And bring him where his suit may be obtained?—*Luc.* 129.

This short letter, printed by Spedding, is dated September, 1593; the poem was published in the following year.

It is fully realised that any of these phrases can be found in the authentic plays and elsewhere. "I cannot choose but weep" is found here and there; it is in the passage quoted from *Hamlet*; in *Cambyeses*, *The London Prodigal*, and *The Puritan Widow*; but I am exposing only that association of many which makes it so improbable that their occurrence together elsewhere at about the same date, is fortuitous.

There are several other letters, long and short, in Hepworth Dixon's book, but I can do nothing with them. That, perhaps, is as well; otherwise it might be thought that anyone could take a page of matter and be tolerably certain of finding similar words and phrases together anywhere in the language in prose and verse. Were the latter possible, something in each of the letters dealt with would be found in every sonnet.

True, much of this may point to Anthony Bacon as author, or part author of this and that, but the main thing is, it does not point to Stratford.

## PIERRE DE RONSARD: A VIGNETTE OF HISTORY.

By ALICIA A. LEITH.

No writer, it is said, save Voltaire, was the object of such idolatry as Ronsard. Joseph Scaliger and De Thou, Queen Margot's great admirer, viewed him the Phoenix of their day.

Born 1524, at fourteen he was page to James V. of Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots' father; stayed three years at the Scotch Court and three months at the English Court. *Au fait* with English, German and Italian he returned to France, to receive honour and benefits from both Francis II. and Charles IX. Tasso, in Paris, was made glad by his appreciation of *Jerusalem Delivered*.

On the accession of Henry III., Ronsard, aged fifty, in retreat at the Abbey of Croix-Val, was recalled by Royal command "to be still young, and write." "Which order," says Ronsard, "gives me courage, though in the autumn of my days; but, at the same time, the dry branch is better than green wood." During Francis Bacon's appointment as Attaché to the French Court, from 1576-9, Ronsard was crowning Margaret of Navarre's beauty and siren charms with adulatory verse. His Complete Works, published 1578, included Sonnets of 1552 to 1578, and on to 1585, the year he died, which is difficult to understand. Greater confusion as to dates was never seen, except perhaps in the Shake-Speare Sonnets. Odes to the older Marguerite de Valois, Duchesse de Savoie, Odes to the younger Marguerite de Valois, Queen of Navarre, are printed higgledy-piggledy, making it sadly difficult to trace which is immortalised at the moment.

Ronsard praises Henry II. because he is the father of Marguerite.

### ODE TO HENRY II. OF FRANCE.

He never did a greater thing  
Than bring into flower  
Immortal Marguerite,



Full of immortal valour,  
Princess whom the Heavens adore.  
And so that in all her graces  
He shall see himself mirrored,  
On her he keeps his eye fixed.

---

ODE TO HENRY DE BOURBON, ROI DE NAVARRE.

Tu viens choisir notre perle Françoise  
Qui n'a pareille en grace ne beauté.  
Le bon dieu d'un lien amoureux  
La belle au beau, jeunesse à la jeunesse,  
La bonne au bon, le Prince à la Princesse.  
Qui vit jamais un accord plus heureux ?

---

EPITAPH TO MARGUERITE DE VALOIS (DUCHESS OF SAVOIE).

La belle Marguerite  
En qui tout le ciel meit sa plus divine part.

---

ODE PARTLY TO THE QUEEN OF NAVARRE, PARTLY TO HER SISTER  
ELIZABETH, QUEEN OF PHILIP II. OF SPAIN.

Princesses Divine  
Race ancien des Dieux.

---

ODE TO MARGUERITE, QUEEN OF NAVARRE.

Princesse que le ciel, les dieux, et la nature  
Ont fait, femme du Roy, soeur et fille de Roy,  
Ont orné de beauté, de constance, et de foy,  
Pour vous faire honorer sur toute creature.  
S'il vous plaît de mes vers presenter la lecture  
Au Roy, mon nouveau Maître, à qui mon tout je doy  
Recommander ma Muse et lui parler de moy,  
Vous serrez ma Déesse, et moy votre facture.  
Jay chanté votre frère, et votre Vaudomois,  
Sur la fin de l'esté, au declin des beaux mois.  
Seule vous invoquant pour ma Muse éternelle  
Voulant de mon país la Muse rechercher,  
Tellement qu'il n'y a bois, antre, n'y rocher,  
Que ne vous dedié, et qui ne vous appelle.

---

SONNET CXCI.

(Vol. I., Les Amours).

Quelque Daimon par le congé des cieus  
Qui presidoit à mon ardeur première,  
Sa belle image au séjour de mes yeux  
Conduit toujours d'une aisle coutoumière  
Toutes les nuits, impatient de haste,  
Entre mes bras je rembrasse et retaste,  
Son vain portrait, en cent formes trompeur.  
Mais quand il voit, que content je sommeille  
Rompant mon aise il s'enfuit, et m'erveille  
Seul en mon lit, plein de honte at de peur.

Did Ronsard's Sonnet CXCI. so impress our young Apollo that he wrote the following?

SONNET LIIIVI.

(By Shake-Speare.)

Was it the proud full sail of his great verse  
Bound for the prize of of-all-too precious you  
That did my ripe thoughts in my brain inhearse,  
Making their tomb the womb wherein they grew?  
Was it his spirit, by spirits taught to write  
Above a mortal pitch, that struck me dead?  
No, neither he, nor his compeers by night  
Giving him aid, my verse astonished  
He nor that affable familiar ghost  
Which nightly gulls him ("trompeur") with intelligence  
As victors of my silence cannot boast.

Pierre de Ronsard's many verses to Queen Margot makes it probable Francis Bacon would have thought as Shake-Speare writes, immortalising his English-French Poet friend.

"There lives more life in one of your fair eyes,  
Than both your poets can in praise devise."

And again:

"Comments of your praise, richly compiled,  
Preserve your character with golden quill.  
And precious phrase by all the Muses filed.  
I think good thoughts, while others write good words,  
In polish'd form of well refined pen."

Ronsard, Reformer of the French language, with "well refined pen" rhymed to new measures, and in this inspired Francis Bacon to become Reformer of the English language, and Creator of Blank Verse. Lover of Shake-Speare's Sonnets, to you I cry as Ronsard cried to his Prince:

"O, s'il vous plait me preter votre oreille."

'Cipher-writing scarcely makes any real appearance in English archives until the reign of Queen Elizabeth. There had been divers isolated examples, as, for instance, as far back as Alfred the Great; but it was scarcely until the days of the Tudors that we find it really in vogue. Many examples of this period are preserved in the British Museum, and in the troublous days of the first Charles we find an immense use of it.'—*Cryptography*, p. 68, by F. Edward Hulme. F.L.S., F.S.A.

## SHAKESPEARE AND BACON.

(The following letter appeared in the *Radio Times* and Mr. Kendra Baker, who has been a member of the Bacon Society for 30 years, sent the reply, which appears beneath it, to the writer).

“With all respect to the President of the Council of the Bacon Society, may I point out that Shakespeare was not a rustic, but the son of a substantial burgess of Stratford who held municipal office in that town? There is nothing in the plays to show that their author was any more an ‘aristocrat’ than Marlowe, the shoemaker’s son, or Milton, whose father was a scrivener. Shakespeare would have been able at Stratford Grammar School to acquire quite as much knowledge of ‘mythological history’ as is shown in the plays. His education, however, did not prevent him from making Hector, in *Troilus* and *Cressida*, quote Aristotle on moral philosophy; or for providing Timon of Athens with friends and followers bearing such impossible names as Ventidius, Flavius, and the like; or from making a clock strike in *Julius Caesar*; or from introducing a King of France and a Duke of Burgundy in *Lear*; or from populating Vienna with Italian ladies and gentlemen in *Measure for Measure*; or from giving Bohemia a seaboard and making it contemporary with the Delphic oracle in *The Winter’s Tale*. As to the ‘scientific and philosophic wisdom’ displayed in Shakespeare, it is hard to find in him a single original idea. He lives, and will live, by his mastery of words—by his ability to express the sheerest commonplaces and sometimes the flattest nonsense in the loveliest language that ever flowed from an English pen—and by his delineation of character; and that must suffice.—*A. Robertson, Athenaeum*.

“Sir.—I notice in your letter to the *Radio Times* of the 8th inst. (July 1932) that you adduce some of the customary ‘anachronisms’ purporting to shew the author’s defective education. It always seems to me a bad thing that the author of the greatest literature of all time should be made to appear an ignoramus to save his reputation.

It is in the hope of removing this error that I am writing. I take them as cited by you in their order.

1. “Young men whom Aristotle thought unfit to hear moral philosophy.” (*Troilus and Cressida*).

It was, of course, *political* philosophy that Aristotle referred to, and the error is admitted; but it is a remark-

able circumstance that Bacon makes precisely the same mistake when he writes:—"Young men are no fit auditors of moral philosophy." So that, as a writer has said, "even in their blunders they were not divided."

2. "Impossible" names in *Timon of Athens*. Ulrici, in his "Dramatic Art of Shakespeare," says "Timon of Athens forms the beautiful close of Shakespeare's poetical career. It reflects more clearly than any other piece the poet's consciousness of the nothingness of human life. No one could have painted misanthropy with such truth and force without having experienced its bitter agony."

This play was never heard of until 1623 when it appeared in the First Folio (Halliwell-Phillipp's "Outlines.") The actor had been dead—unwept, unhonoured and unsung—for seven years, leaving no MSS. or books. The play is biographical. The catastrophe of his life had just overwhelmed Bacon. The author hurls invectives at false friends. The "beautiful close" of the actor's career was in the "odour of prosperity"—a successful merchant and money-lender to whom the "nothingness of human life" had certainly not brought it "bitter agony." In point of fact, he had done himself uncommonly well.

Thus the play reflects the experiences of Bacon and *not* of Shakespeare—a common phenomenon.

That the names of some of the characters of this personal tragedy should not seem as appropriate to the setting as "Edwin and Angelina" to a Victorian novel is a somewhat superficial aspect of the circumstance. You might criticise half the characters in Barclay's *Argenis* on similar grounds, until their etymology has been analysed.

The probability is that they were selected for their peculiar suggestiveness and appropriateness to the actual characters the author was covertly portraying. Instances of this are found throughout the literature of the period and was a recognised form of dramatic and poetic license.

3. A striking clock in *Julius Caesar*.

Seeing that there was no such thing as scenery in the Elizabethan drama, and that the "hour of three" was a dramatic incident of great importance to the situation,



how was this to be conveyed to an Elizabethan audience except by the dramatic license of a striking clock? Is it suggested that a water-clock should have been brought on (like "Wall" in *M.N.D.*!) and if so it had, would it have conveyed anything at all—but burlesque—to an audience as ignorant of such an instrument as of a wireless set?

It is perfectly obvious that the author—whoever he may have been—was no ignoramus, for in *Act II.*, s.i. he illustrates the popular confusion due to the introduction of Caesar's new Calendar into Rome, and which, by the way, Bacon thought so highly of that he describes it as "a monument both of his power and learning." It was one of the early "error-hunters," Lewis Theobald, who, in 1733 took upon himself to ruin the whole historical and scientific allusion by substituting for "the *first* of March,"—as the author wrote it, and which is correct,—"the *Ides* of March," which is unhistorical, unscientific and wrong. So much for the enthusiasm of error-hunters!

Dramatic license has existed and been recognized in all ages where the exigencies of the drama demanded it, and it is no more an indication of ignorance than is that where Goethe, in his *Egmont*, makes Machiavelli Margaret of Parma's secretary, though the former died fifty years before Margaret's time.

Are we to brand Sir Walter Scott as ignorant because in his *Lay of the Last Minstrel* he introduces Sir Michael Scott, a wizard who flourished 400 years before?

Goethe himself says: "Shakespeare turns his Romans into Englishmen, and he does right, for otherwise his nation would not have understood him." Evidently Goethe had more perception than other critics we wot of!

"Poesy," as Bacon says, "is feigned history which not being tied to the laws of matter may at pleasure join that which Nature hath severed, and sever that which Nature hath joined, and so make unlawful matches and divorces of things." And, again, Dr. Johnson says, "There is no reason why an hour should not be a century in the calenture of the brains that can make the stage a field."

4 and 5. "A King of France and a Duke of Burgundy"

in *Lear* and "Italian ladies and gentlemen in Vienna" in *Measure for Measure*.

"Dramatic license to meet the exigencies of the drama 'might equally apply here—especially where the 'ignorance' hypothesis is directly negated elsewhere—but without an exhaustive study of the kaleidescopic changes in dynastic conditions of Central Europe, it would be rash in the extreme to attribute these incidents to ignorance. See next answer.

6. "Bohemia a sea-board."

This is the die-hard of "anachronisms" and crops up regularly, like the Sea Serpent in the Silly Season!

Apart from the assertion of Sir Clements Markham, the geographer, that in the sixteenth century the boundaries of Bohemia extended to the Adriatic, there is evidence which has been laboriously collected by certain "ignorant Baconians" who have taken the trouble to study the obscure and tangled history of Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Austria, and the various petty principalities to the north of the Adriatic, that Bohemia in the 15th and 16th centuries extended, through accessions of territory and dynastic changes, from the Baltic to the Adriatic.

The history of the evolution of Bohemia as a maritime country extends from 1253 when Ottakar became King of Bohemia to 1526 when Ferdinand, grandson of the Emperor Maximilian, became, by his marriage with Anna, daughter of Ladistans II., King of Bohemia, and also by the death of her brother, Louis II., King of all the States extending from the Baltic to the Adriatic.

This history is far too lengthy to set out in detail, but can be studied in J. Phinney Baxter's book, *The Greatest of Literary Problems*, p. 495 (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston).

I also have a note of the following extracts from "Europe, 1450—1759," by E. R. Turner, Ph.D., 1924 (Heinemann):—"In the 13th century it (Bohemia) conquered Austria and other districts near by, and was extended until it had a sea-coast on the Adriatic" (p. 45) and "During the Middle Ages there was a time when great

Czechish Kings built up a flourishing kingdom that reached down besides the German lands to a sea-coast on the Adriatic" (p. 630).

Thus, when a Bohemian sea-coast is counted unto the author for ignorance it operates as a boomerang and comes back and hits the critic.

But not only is it a sign, not of ignorance, but of knowledge: it is an indication of the *exceptional* knowledge of one versed in the complicated history of Central Europe than was Ben Jonson, or Shakespearean Critics, for the former told Drummond (*before* he had gained enlightenment as to the true authorship) that "Shakespeare wanted arte" and that in a play brought in a number of men saying they had suffered shipwreck in Bohemia, where there is no sea neer by some 100 miles."

Ben Jonson may have been "rare," but his knowledge of European geography and history left something to be desired.

Your Mr. Shakspere must have been a singularly gifted person, rather than an ignoramus, and you do him a grievous injustice in belittling his marvellous attainments—gained no one knows how!

Yet making all allowances for "error," both actual or apparent, and whether due to dramatic license, want of knowledge, or possession of special knowledge, there is no dispute as to the existence of errors in the plays. "Paradoxical as it may seem, however, these very blemishes, as a writer has pointed out, are a distinct indication of Bacon's authorship. We find the same in his prose works. The great philosopher, notwithstanding his industry and his learning, was singularly careless in some of the minutiae of his work. The sublime confidence with which he employed his mental powers often made a sinner of his memory.' It was simply impossible, in the multiplicity and magnitude of his productions, particularly if the Plays be super-added, to prevent unimportant errors from creeping in. In no other way can we account for the fake quotation from Solomon in the *Essay of Revenge*, or that from Tacitus in the *Essay of Traditions*. The

grammatical mistakes in the Latin entries of the *Promus*, written with his own hand, would send a school-boy to the bottom of his class, but they put a tongue in every wound of syntax found in Plays," says Edwin Reed (*Bacon versus Shakspeare*).

And so in his *Apothegms*,—full of little, unimportant historical errors which it is surprising some of our literati and illuminati have not pitched upon in order to shew what "an ignorant person" Bacon really was, and if only he had sat at the feet of the one and only William, how much he might have learnt!

Instead of which they labour to shew that Bacon could not possibly have written the stuff attributed to "ignorant" Shakspeare, because of all the errors!

Alas! to what has Stratfordian criticism sunk.

I am naturally not writing this to the *Radio Times*. Its readers like to be "amused," not "instructed," and beating Bacon with a big stick—the ruder and rougher the better—is as popular as a Punch and Judy show on the beach, and never fails to provide entertainment at no cost of intellectual exercise.

Yours faithfully,

H. KENDRA BAKER."

#### GOLD, THE AUTOCRAT OF EXCHANGE.

Lord Melchett scoffed at the gold standard, in the House of Lords last night, and moved a resolution declaring that the existence of poverty and unemployment shows that the present money system is obsolete and a hindrance to production and distribution of goods.

He called on the Government to bring forward proposals for the economic reforms necessary "to enable the subjects of this realm to enjoy the benefits to which their present productive capacity entitles them."

The Government opposed Lord Melchett's motion, and it was defeated by 14 to 10.



## THE ENGLISH RÉNAISSANCE.

By M. F. BAYLEY.

**T**HIS vast subject that we Baconians are only "coasting" has one thing needful and that is, if we can, to use Bacon's own words.

Francis Bacon, in his dedication to King James in the *De Augmentis*, says:—"Truly I (worthiest King), in speaking of myself as matters stand, both in that which I now publish, and in that which I plan for the future, I often, consciously and purposely, cast aside the dignity of my genius and my name (if any such thing be), while I serve the welfare of humanity."

The curious fact that after "my name" he says "*if any such thing be*," showing he had *no* name and therefore any name "would smell as sweet." If he were, as most Baconians believe, the son of Elizabeth, he *had* no name; Bacon was as much a label as Peele, Green, Marlowe, Shakespeare, or Spenser might be.

In the 1640 *Advancement of Learning*, Wat's Edition (which is undoubtedly Bacon's original *English* Edition) he speaks of "the Duke of Guise," of whom it was usually said he was the greatest usurer in France because that all his wealth was in names, and that he turned all his estate into obligations. In the margin against this paragraph is "S. Fran. Bacon. Apol." This page is mispaginated 53, but is really 55, as Mr. W. F. C. Wigston points out in "Hermes Stella." 53 is the number of the pages when the word *Bacon* appears in the plays—*M.W.W.* and *1st K.H.IV.*

If, as I believe, nearly all the Elizabethan literature was the work of Francis Bacon, he used hundreds of names to write under and, if so, *his wealth consisted of names*, and he links Bacon with the Duke of Guise.

Mr. Wigston's "Hermes Stella" points out how Bacon used numbers and mispaginated pages to tell his secret.

## 140 The English Rénaissance.

To return to Bacon's own statements, he again says elsewhere that he has "foregone his name and fame." Again, in his account of *Henry IV.*, he says, "though it grew from me it went about in *others' names*" (my italics).

He speaks of being good "*to concealed poets.*"

BACONIANA (1679) says:—"And those who have true skill in the works of the Lord Verulam, like great masters in painting, can tell by the *design*, the *strength*, the way of *colouring*, whether he was the author of this or the other piece, though his name be not to it."

In *Manes Verulamiani* it says, "He has filled the world with volumes." Bacon's works are about eleven volumes. He has said that he wrote works on religion; there are no works bearing his name.

Macaulay said he had "the most exquisite intellect ever bestowed on the children of men."

He left Cambridge having learnt all that it could teach him. When he was in France he had a tutor and stayed at Poitiers, where there was a famous university. He must have come into contact with Ronsard and the Pléiade, who were making a *language* for France and who were helping in the Rénaissance of literature and learning. While he was in France, Pallissy the Potter was lecturing on Natural Science at his "Petit Academie." It is inconceivable that this rare and gifted genius did not think of a Rénaissance for England. What do we find? He returns to England in 1579, and *not one book or any sort of literature* is written by him. He writes pamphlets for the Queen on his travels, but not for eighteen years does he put pen to paper. Then a modest book of 10 essays is published by him in 1597. Eighteen years of absolute silence—it is beyond all belief.

In the meantime the presses of England are working overtime and a constant stream of poetry, pamphlets, plays and every kind of literature is pouring forth, placing England above the Continent in the variety and quality of its marvellous productions.

It would be supposed that scholars and well known writers of repute were the authors of this stupendous output. But

curiously enough they are the works of a gutter fraternity who spend their nights in debauchery and their days in broils. Nothing is known of their lives. Is it credible?

I maintain these men (if they existed) sold their *names* to Francis Bacon. I am convinced by internal evidence that most of Chapman is by Francis Bacon. I get a life of Chapman, it begins, "nothing is known of Edward Chapman." and the author then proceeds to link him with a family near Hitchin and writes a long work about him.

The same vagueness applies to all these men, they *die* before they publish their works! So they all attain posthumous fame, Peele, Marlowe, Spenser; all their plays and works are published after their deaths.

Is it credible? Has not the world been gulled too long? I think Baconians should collate all their predecessors have done in attributing these works to Francis Bacon and spend more time in finding out means of showing the world to-day that this "exquisite intellect" was indeed the author of most if not all of those curious books and masterpieces of this period—1593 was a fatal year for Francis Bacon. Francis stayed the Queen's subsidy and from then the money she had undoubtedly given him stopped. From then the literature grows. *Venus and Adonis* is published in the name of Shakespeare in 1593. *The Rape of Lucrece* is 1594, and in 1594 he sought to reconcile Essex to the Queen and published the *Conference of Pleasure*.

The years 94, 95, and 96, are great years of production. In 1597 the Play of *Richard II* is played with the deposing scene and in 1598 the play is printed with Shakespeare's name, when the author is to be racked.

Bacon's 1st book of *Essays*, his first heir of his invention is published in 1597, his *De Augmentis* in 1605. So that he did not write under his own name till 1597, though it was well known that he was writing books in Gray's Inn before that. The late Mr. Harman thought the early latin play of *Pedantius* was by Bacon. I have it in a book bound up with Bacon's own works. No one knowing Francis Bacon can believe he was idle all those years. Mr. Harold Bayley in the *Shakespeare Symphony* has pointed out that all those

## 142 The English Rénaissance.

degraded authors had the same lofty style and beautiful thoughts. They all pray the same lovely prayers about their works, as Francis Bacon did:

*George Peele*: "Then help Divine Adonai to conduct upon the wings of my well-tempered verse the hearer's mind above the Towers of Heaven.

*Massinger*: "Prosper Thou great Existence my Endeavours as they religiously are undertaken and distant equally from servile gain."

*Bacon*: "May Thou therefore O Father guard and direct this work which issuing from Thy goodness seeks in return Thy Glory."

One can only believe the great master was at work all through those eighteen years of silence before he published his ten essays, in working on and building up the great English Rénaissance, the glory of the world, which has not been surpassed even "by insolent Greece and haughty Rome."

---

### BACONIAN LECTURES.

A Lecture was delivered on 3rd February last year by Henry Seymour, under the auspices of the Lydgate Society, Hertford. The title was "Who was Shakespeare?" which attracted a full audience and carried almost general conviction that "Bacon" was the man. Miss Leith addressed the members at Canonbury on the following evening with "Large Brow'd Verulam"; on March 3rd. Mr. Bridgewater's subject was "Does it Matter?"; on April 7th. Mr. Theobald stated "The case for Francis Bacon as Shakespeare"; on May 5th. Miss Sennett gave a psychological exposition of "Hamlet"; on June 2nd. Mrs. Vernon Bayley spoke on "The English Renaissance"; on July 7th. Henry Seymour ventured "A criticism of Bacon's essay 'of Love'"; on 1st Sept. Mr. Bridgewater gave a pungent paper on "The Oxford Theory Criticized," when Mr. Percy Allen was present, and a lively discussion ensued; on October 6th, Mr. Horace Nickson gave a paper on "Elizabeth, Bacon, and Essex"; on November 3rd, Miss A. A. Leith gave an interesting account of Francis Bacon in Italy and elsewhere; on December 1st, Mr. Lewis Biddulph gave some interesting speculations on "The Poetic and Symbolic Imagery of Francis Bacon in his acknowledged writings." Mr. Percy Allen replied to his critic at length on January 5th of the present year.

---

### SHAKESPEARE LAYS DOWN NEWTON'S LAW OF GRAVITATION!

"The strong base and building of my love,  
Is as the very centre of the earth,  
Drawing all things to it."—*Troilus and Cressida*, IV., ii.



## THE FIRST BACONIAN.

BY LORD SYDENHAM OF COMBE.

(Reprinted by permission from *Fly-Leaves*, Aug. 1932)

For many years the authorship of the "Shakespeare" literature aroused no interest, and the few who knew the secret kept silence. The Elizabethan period produced several playwrights of note, and the transcendent qualities of the master mind were beyond the grasp of all except a small group of highly cultured men of letters.

Samuel Pepys, a shrewd critic and an admirer of "Shakespeare," born nine years after the appearance of the First Folio, wrote that he had read *Othello* "which I ever esteemed a mighty good play; but," he significantly added, "after having so lately read *'the Adventures of Five Houres'*, it seems a mean thing." Posterity formed a different opinion; but many other persons in Pepys's day probably had as little sense of values as the diarist.

Ben Jonson's apparently contradictory views have supplied much blank ammunition to Stratfordians, though they can easily be explained. When the bright new light rose on the horizon, he seems to have discerned a dangerous rival, and was moved either to scorn or to pettifogging cavils. From an "epigram" published in the year of Shakspeare's death, but written some time before, he appears to have reached the conclusion that the new dramatic luminary was a broker of other men's goods. His words bear no other meaning:

"Poor Poet Ape, that would be thought our chief,  
Whose works are e'en the frippery of wit,  
From Brokage is become so bold a thief  
As we, the robbed, leave rage and pity it."

The "epigram" goes on to say that the broker had "now grown to a little wealth and credit on the scene."

In *Every Man out of his Humour* Jonson presented

Shakspere as Sogliardo, son of a farmer, "an essential clown," who is made to say:

"I have been so toiled among the harrots yonder, you will not believe, they do speak in the strangest language and give a man the hardest terms that you ever knew. . . . I' faith I thank God I can write myself a gentleman now; here's my patent; it cost me thirty pounds by this breath,"

It was in 1597 that John Shakspere, or Shagspere, obtained a coat of arms from the "harrots" (heralds) after much misrepresentation, and the identification appears complete.

Jonson, however, came to work with Bacon, and assisted in bringing out the First Folio. The magnificent panegyric introducing the collected Plays is admitted by Stratfordians to be his work. The "Poor Poet Ape," from being a "thief" had become "THE AUTHOR" of whom Jonson could say:

"Leave thee alone for the comparison  
Of all that insolent Greece or haughtie Rome  
Sent forth, on since did from their ashes come."

Jonson had discovered the secret, and this phrase, borrowed from Seneca, exactly fits the immortal works which alone stand comparison with the ancient classics to-day. Knowing the truth, he felt constrained to write in his "Discoveries" after the death of THE AUTHOR that Bacon also "has filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred to insolent Greece or haughtie Rome." Both were in fact "the acme" of our language.

In his "Scriptorum Catalogus," Jonson gave a list of the great thinkers and orators of his time, placing Bacon at the head and omitting the dramatist described as the "Soul of the Age" in the First Folio. After this, his apparently inconsistent statements, especially those in his rambling "de Shakespeare Nostrati," found among his papers after his death in 1637 cannot be taken seriously. He knew and had proved that he knew the authorship.

Contemporary allusions to the Plays are not many and can mean only acquiescence—conscious or not—in a pseudonym, just as the reading public accepted George

Eliot and did not trouble about the name of the authoress. The greatest writers and thinkers of the age—including Bacon, Sidney, Pembroke, Raleigh, Cecil, Walsingham, Selden, Wootton and Donne—left no allusion to the “Starre of Poets.” Some may have known the secret; but the inference is that, in their day, the “Shakespearean” literature had not attained the pinnacle of honour which Bacon, well understanding, said would be forthcoming from “mine own countrymen after many years be passed.”

His devoted chaplain, Rawley, collected thirty-two tributes published by scholars of the day after his death. Of these revealing testimonies, twenty-seven dealt with the outstanding poetic genius of the dead master. As Mr. R. L. Eagle justly claims,

“Here is undisputed contemporary evidence that Bacon was known to his intimates as the greatest of all poets and dramatists.”

In the 18th and 19th centuries, the Myth grew to formidable proportions. As Bacon had written: “We also see the Reign or Tyranny of Custom, what it is.” The curious “Custom” of attributing to an uneducated rustic such a polished classical poem as *Venus and Adonis* written a few years after leaving his illiterate family, grew into “Tyranny,” which, being quickly entrenched behind a Hindenberg line of vested interests, seemed to be impregnable when Barnum had discovered the “Birthplace” and made it world-famous. The fortification remained—we believed—unchallenged until it dawned upon Mr. Joseph Hart, American Consul at Santa Cruz in 1848, the year of my birth, that the money-lending actor could not have been THE AUTHOR. Poor Delia Bacon followed, and her life spent in an unequal struggle with obscurantism ended in tragedy; but a torch was lighted at last which burns fiercely to-day.

We now know, however, that Mr. Hart was not the first champion of the truth, and that he was anticipated by an Englishman, the Rev. J. Wilmot, D.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, a little village a few miles north of Stratford, who, about 1785, not only dethroned the sing-

ularly unattractive imposter, but rediscovered THE AUTHOR.\*

In the *Times Literary Supplement* of January-February last, Professor Allardyce Nicoll tells a story which should profoundly interest every Baconian student. Just before his death, Sir E. Durning Lawrence obtained and bequeathed to the London University a "thin quarto volume," containing in manuscript the text of an address entitled "Some reflections on the life of William Shakespeare," read before the Ipswich Philosophical Society by James Corton Cowell on 7th February, 1805.

Mr. Cowell had a terrible confession to make to the Suffolk philosophers, who were naturally horrified. He had promised:

"during the session of 1803 to read a paper on the genius of the poets Shakespeare and Milton. . . . I undertook the task of enlarging yet further on the Life of Shakespeare."

But, unfortunately, he found himself in a

"Strange pass . . . a Pervert, nay a Renegade to the faith I have proclaimed and avowed before you. . . . prepared to hear from you, as I unfold my strange and surprising story, cries of disapproval and even of execration."

What had happened was that, when searching for material for the promised address, he, like many later investigators, discovered—nothing.

"Everywhere was I met by a strange and perplexing silence."

This would not have mattered, and Sir Sidney Lee was to prove later that a large volume could be written with the

---

\*A curious book entitled "The Life and Adventures of Common Sense: an Historical Allegory," was published anonymously in 1769, which introduces a character called "Wisdom," obviously Bacon, who "made an acquaintance with a person belonging to the Playhouse," who "was a profligate in his youth and some say a *Deerstaler*." "Wisdom" had a "Common Place Book" containing "rules on the combinations and connections upon every subject or occasion that might arise in dramatic writing." Thus equipped "the person" commenced Play-writing, and "his name was Shakespeare!" The author of this book, who had—like Jonson—discovered that "Shakespeare" was a wholesale plagiarist, though he credits the impostor with "good parts," was supposed on little evidence to be a physician named Herbert Lawrence. (Conf: an article by Mrs. A. Chambers Buntin in *FLY-LEAVES*, November 1919, and in *BACONIANA*, March, 1920.)



most scanty and unsatisfactory material; but much worse lay behind. He had come across "an ingenious gentleman" of the neighbourhood of Stratford-on-Avon, who had an "explanation" of the hopeless want of evidence

"that is so startling that it is easy to understand his timidity in putting it forth boldly, and I share his reticence. My Friend has a story, which he supports with much ingenuity, that the real author of the Plays attributed to Shakespeare was Sir Francis Bacon."

This announcement must have fallen as a bolt from the blue upon the assembled philosophers, and something like a row seems to have followed. Cowell, however, undertook, under a solemn vow of secrecy, to divulge the name of the "ingenious gentleman" who had made him "a Pervert, nay a Renegade," and he was able to give an interesting account of the origin of the heresy at which the orthodox Society stood aghast. He told them that

"Dr. Wilmot does not venture to say definitely that Sir Francis Bacon was the author; but, through his great knowledge of the works of that writer, he is able to prepare a cap which fits him amazingly."

The learned Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, then an octogenarian, had been struck some years earlier by the allusion to the circulation of the blood in *Coriolanus*. He had noted that Biron, Dumain and Longaville in *Love's Labour Lost* (the first play attributed to the actor) were "the names of the ministers" at the Court of Navarre when Anthony Bacon resided there and would certainly be unknown in the rather exceptionally backward town of Stratford, or in the sordid purlieus of an Elizabethan theatre. Realising, as should any literary man, that the author must have had a large and very valuable library, Dr. Wilmot proceeded to search for specimens and

"covered himself with the dust of every private bookcase for 50 miles round."

Stratford, naturally without any result. Imbued, like Dr. Hotson, with the true spirit of research, he diligently collected all the traditions regarding Shakspeare or Shagspere and his contemporaries that were then available. He thus came across a legend of

“a certain man of extreme ugliness and tallness, who Blackmailed the Farmers under threat of bewitching their cattle.”

There was also the usual legend of some exploit of the devil with other stories still lingering by the banks of the Avon. Dr. Wilmot seems to have been impressed by the absence of all such local colour in the Plays, and Professor Nicoll, who evidently has no knowledge of the now huge volume of Baconian research, naively remarks in this connection that:

“Wilmot’s method of argumentation thus seems to have differed little from the methods employed by his followers.”

Why should they differ, and how could Baconians avoid “argumentation” based on the fact that the Plays contain no allusion to the only bit of the countryside that the actor could have known well, while they refer 23 times to St. Albans which there is no reason to suppose he ever saw?

Of Cowell and the Philosophical Society no more transpires. The secret must have been kept, and we might never have heard of the first Baconian if this revolutionary address had not been preserved; but a tragedy followed, during “the very year” when the “renegade” was incurring “execration,” Dr. Wilmot, who had never dared to come out into the open and may have feared a storm as the result of Cowell’s revelations, suddenly burned all his Shakespearean papers, and his studies and researches towards the end of the 18th century were irretrievably lost. The “Tyranny” has prevailed, and the truth dropped back to the bottom of the well, there to remain for more than 50 years.

As for Dr. Wilmot, Professor Nicoll refers to his Life by his niece, published in 1813, which shows him to have been born at Warwick in 1726, just one hundred years after Bacon’s death. The writer claims for him the authorship of the Letters of Junius, and while recording nothing about his Shakespearean studies, states that her uncle placed “Lord Bacon’s works” in her hands “at a very early age and desired her to read his Essays very frequently.”

In a leading article on “The First Baconian,” *The*

*Times* is characteristically contemptuous, and makes fun, in the Stratfordian manner, of his successors, "The drollest touch of all," it remarks, is the fact that, just when

"The critics were beginning to make him (Shakespeare) divine, Stratford-on-Avon was beginning to make him good business . . . the man who saw through all this was living within six or seven miles of Stratford-on-Avon."

The drollery is somewhat obscure; but there is no doubt as to the "good business" or its intimate connection with the persistence of the fantastic illusion which Dr. Wilmot recognised as such. From the little we know of his researches, his papers having been unhappily destroyed in fear of the "Tyranny," it appears that, apart from the realisation of the want of local colour in the Plays, he was profoundly impressed by the close similarity in form and thought of the "Shakespeare" and the avowed Baconian literature. Like Mr. Gerald Massey, more than a century later, Dr. Wilmot saw clearly that:

"The philosophical writings of Bacon are suffused and saturated with Shakespeare's thought . . . These likenesses of thought and expression are mainly confined to these two contemporaries. It may be admitted that one must have copied the other!"

It is certainly a portentous fact that two men living at the same time should have possessed all the knowledge then available, should have used the same words and modes of expression, and should have freely copied from each other without leaving a scintilla of evidence that they ever met.

Dr. Wilmot may not have known the existence of Bacon's "Promus" of which "Shakespeare" was a wholesale plagiarist, or of the devastating "Northumberland Manuscript," which Stratfordians have either never heard of or discreetly ignore. He may, however, have been aware that the bust at Stratford was completely changed in 1748 to represent a personage with a hirsute appendage never discovered on an Englishman of this date. He noted the tell-tale allusion to the circulation of the blood; but he probably did not know, that Harvey was Bacon's physician. Whether he discovered that an expert in cyphers had written his name liberally in places where it

might be observed, or whether he had come across the fine allegorical engravings, designed with evident purpose, to accompany some of Bacon's works, we cannot know. Most of the huge volume of recent Baconian research of which the "Tyranny of Custom" robs the dupes of the Myth, became available a century too late for his guidance; but a strong literary sense led him to the truth.

Baconians must in the future hold the memory of Dr. Wilmot—their venerable forerunner of the 18th century—in special honour.

---

"Stephens states that the Earl of Oxford placed in his hands some neglected manuscripts and loose papers to see whether any of the Lord Bacon's compositions lay concealed there and were fit for publication. He found some of them written, and others amended, with his Lordship's own hand. He found certain treatises had been published by him, and that others, certainly genuine, which had not, were fit to be transcribed if not divulged."

—*The Mystery of Francis Bacon*, by WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

---

#### ANAGRAMMATIC CYPHERS.

"The 'true' modern critics on our elder writers are apt to thunder their anathemas on innocent heads: little versed in the eras of our literature, and the fashions of our wit, popular criticism must submit to be guided by the literary historian. Kippis condemns Sir Symonds D'Ewes for his admiration of two anagrams, expressive of the feelings of the times. It required the valor of Falstaff to attack extinct anagrams; and our pretended English Bayle thought himself secure, in pronouncing all anagrammatists to be wanting in judgment and taste: yet, if this mechanical critic did not know something of the state and nature of anagrams in Sir Symonds' day, he was more deficient in that curiosity of literature, which his work required, than plain, honest Sir Symonds in the taste and judgment of which he is so contemptuously deprived. The author who thus decides on the tastes of another age by those of his own day, and whose knowledge of the national literature does not extend beyond his own century, is neither historian nor critic. The truth is that *Anagrams* were then the fashionable amusement of the wittiest and the most learned."—*Isaac Disraeli*.



# INTERROGATORIES OF FRANCIS BACON.

## III.

*Mercurii 21<sup>o</sup> die Martii, 1620.*

Sir *Robert Phillips* reports from the Committee appointed to examine *Keeling* and *Churchil*, who inform'd many Corruptions against the Lord Chancellor.

1. In the Cause betwixt *Hull* and *Holeman*, *Hull* gave or lent my Lord one thousand pound since the Suit began.

2. In the Cause between *Wroth* and *Manwaring*, there were one hundred Pieces given, of which *Hunt* had 20l.

3. *Hoddy* gave a Jewel which was thought to be worth 500l. but he himself said it was a trifle of a hundred or two hundred Pound Price. It was presented to the Lord Chancellor by Sir *Thomas Peryn* and Sir *Henry Holmes*.

4. In the Cause between *Peacock* and *Reynell*, there was much Money given on both sides.

5. In the Cause of *Barker* and *Bill*, *Barker* said he was 800l. out in Gifts since this Suit began.

6. In the Cause between *Smithwick* and *Welsh*, *Smithwick* gave 300l. yet my Lord decreed it against him; so he had his Money again by piecemeal.

In this and other Causes, my Lord would decree Part; and when he wanted more Money he would send for more, and then decree another Part.

In most Causes my Lord's Servants have undertaken one Side or another; insomuch as it was usual for Council, when their Clients came unto them, to ask what Friend they had at *York-house*.

Mr. *Mewtys*. Touching the Persons that inform, I would intreat this honourable House to consider that *Keeling* is a common Solicitor (to say no more of him), *Churchil* a guilty Register by his own Confession: I know that Fear of Punishment, and Hopes of lessening it, may make them to say much, yea more than is true.

For my own part, I must say I have been an Observer of my Lord's Proceedings; I know he hath sown the good Seed of Justice, and I hope that it will prove that the envious Man hath sown those Tares.

I humbly desire that these Generals may not be sent up to the Lords, unless these Men will testify them in particular.

*Ordered,*

That a Message be sent to the Lords by Sir *Robert Phillips*, to relate the Case of the Lady *Wharton*, and the Informations of *Churchil*.

Sir *Robert Phillips* reports from the Lords, that they acknowledged the great Care of this House in these important Businesses; return Thanks for the Correspondence of this House with them,

## 152 Interrogatories of Francis Bacon.

and assure the like from them for ever to this House. In these and all other things they will advise, and return Answer as soon as possible.

And then Adjourn'd, &c.

### PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

On *Monday*, the 19th Day of *March*, 1620, in the Afternoon, the Commons had a Conference with the Lords: which Conference was reported the next Day by the *Lord Treasurer*; That it was the desire of the Commons to inform their Lordships of the great Abuses of the Courts of Justice, the Information whereof was divided into these three Parts.

*First*, The Persons accused.

*Secondly*, The Matters objected against them.

*Thirdly*, The Proofs.

The Persons are the Lord Chancellor of *England*, and the now Bishop of *Landaff*, being then no Bishop, but *Dr. Field*.

The incomparable good Parts of the Lord Chancellor were highly commended, the Place he holds magnified, from whence Bounty, Justice and Mercy were to be distributed to the Subjects, with which he was solely trusted; whither all great Causes were drawn, and from whence no Appeal lay for any Injustice or Wrong done, save to the Parliament.

That the Lord Chancellor was accused of great Bribery and Corruption\* committed by him in this eminent Place; whereof two Cases were alleged. The one concerning *Christopher Awbrey*, and the other concerning *Edward Egerton*.

1. In the Cause depending in the Chancery between the said *Awbrey* and Sir *William Bronker*, *Awbrey* feeling some hard Measure, was advised to give the Lord Chancellor 100*l.* the which he delivered to his Council, Sir *George Hastings*, and he to the Lord Chancellor: This Business proceeding slowly notwithstanding, *Awbrey* did write divers Letters, and delivered them to the Lord Chancellor, to which he never obtained any Answer from his Lordship; but at last delivering another Letter, his Lordship answered, *If he importuned him, he would lay him by the Heels*.

The Proofs of this Accusation are five.

*First*, Sir *George Hastings* relating it long since unto Sir *Charles Montague*.

*Secondly*, The Lord Chancellor fearing this would be complained of, desired Silence of Sir *George Hastings*.

*Thirdly*, Sir *George Hastings*' Testimony thereof, which was not voluntary, but urged.

*Fourthly*, The Lord Chancellor desired Sir *George Hastings* to bring the Party *Awbrey* unto him, and promised Redress of the Wrongs done him.

*Fifthly*, That the Lord Chancellor said unto Sir *George Hastings*, if he should affirm the giving of this 100*l.* his Lordship would and must deny if upon his Honour.

2. The Case of Sir *Edward Egerton* is this: There being divers

---

\* 3 Co.Inst. 148.

## Interrogatories of Francis Bacon. 153

Suits between *Edward Egerton* and *Sir Rowland Egerton* in the Chancery, *Edward Egerton* presented his Lordship, a little after he was Lord Keeper, with a Bason and Ewer of the Value of 50*l.* and upwards; and afterwards he delivered unto *Sir George Hastings*, and *Sir Richard Young*, 400*l.* in Gold.

*Sir Richard Young* presented it to his Lordship, who took it, and poised it, and said it was too much; and returned Answer, that *Mr. Egerton* had not only enriched him, but had laid a tye upon his Lordship to do him Favour in all his just Causes.

The Proofs for this are the Testimony of *Sir George Hastings*, and the Testimony of *Merefill* a Scrivener thus far, that he took up 700*l.* for *Mr. Egerton*; *Mr. Egerton* then telling him that a great part of it was to be given to the Lord Chancellor, and that *Mr. Egerton* afterwards told him that the 400*l.* in Gold was given to the Lord Chancellor.

At this Conference was farther declared somewhat relating to a Bishop, who was touched in this Business upon the bye, whose Function was much honoured, but his Person touched herein: The Business depending between the *Egertons* being order'd against *Edward Egerton*, he procured a new Reference thereof from the King to the Lord Chancellor; his Lordship demanded the Parties to be bound in 6000 Marks to stand to his Lordship's Award; they having entered into that Bond, his Lordship awarded the matter against *Edward Egerton* for *Sir Rowland Egerton*; but *Edward Egerton* refusing to stand to the said Award, a new Bill was exhibited in the Chancery, and thereupon his Lordship ordered that this Bond of 6000 Marks should be assigned unto *Sir Rowland Egerton*, and he to put the same in Suit in his Lordship's Name.

The Bishop of *Landaff*, as a Friend to *Mr. Edward Egerton*, adviseth with *Randolph Damport* and *Butler* (which *Butler* is now dead) that they would procure a stay of the Decree of that Award, and procure a new Hearing; upon which it was agreed, that the said 6000 Marks should be given for this by *Edward Egerton*, and shared amongst them, and amongst certain Noble Persons.

A Recognizance of 10,000 Marks was required from *Mr. Egerton* to the Bishop for the Performance hereof; the Bishop his Share of this 6000 Marks was so great, as no Court of Justice would allow.

To prove this, they produce Letters of the Bishop, naming the Sum and setting down a Course how these 6,000 Marks might be rais'd, viz. the Land in question to be decreed for *Mr. Egerton*, and out of that the Money to be levied, and if this were not effected, then the Bishop *in verbo sacerdotis* promised to deliver up this Recognizance to be cancelled; the new Recognizance is sealed accordingly, and *Randolph Damport* rides to Court, and moved the \*Lord Admiral for his Lordship's Letter to the Lord Chancellor herein; but his Lordship denied to meddle in a cause depending in Suit.

Then the said *Randolph Damport* assayed to get the King's Letter, but failed therein also; so that the Good they intended to *Mr. Egerton* was not effected, and yet the Bishop, tho' required, refused to deliver up the said Recognizance, until *Mr. Egerton* threatened to complain thereof unto the King.

---

\* *Duke of Buckingham.*

## 154 Interrogatories of Francis Bacon.

The Lord Treasurer shewed also that the Commons do purpose, that if any more of this kind happen to be complained of before them they will present the same to your Lordships, wherein they shall follow the antient Precedents, which shew that great Persons have been accused for the like in Parliament.

They humbly desire, that for-as-much as this concerneth a Person of so great Eminency, it may not depend long before your Lordships that the Examination of the Proofs may be expedited, and if he be found Guilty, then to be punished; if not Guilty, the now Accusers to be punished.

This being reported, the Lord Admiral presented to the House a Letter written unto their Lordships; the Tenor whereof follows:

*My very good Lords;*

I Humbly pray your Lordships all to make a favourable and true Construction of my Absence; it is no feigning nor fainting, but sickness, both of my Heart, and of my Back, tho' joined with that Comfort of Mind, that persuades me, that I am not far from Heaven, whereof I feel the first Fruits; and because whether I live or die, I would be glad to preserve my Honour and Fame as far as I am worthy; hearing that some Complaints of base Bribery are coming before your Lordships, my Requests unto your Lordships are;

*First*, That you will maintain me in your good opinion without Prejudice, until my Cause be heard.

*Secondly*, That in regard I have sequestered my Mind at this time in great part from worldly Things, thinking of my Accompt and Answer in a Higher Court, your Lordships would give me convenient Time, according to the Course of other Courts, to advise with my Council, and to make my Answer; wherein nevertheless my Council's part will be the least, for I shall not by the Grace of God trick up an Innocency with Cavillations, but plainly and ingeniously, as your Lordships know my manner is, declare what I know or remember.

*Thirdly*, That according to the Course of Justice, I may be allowed to except to the Witnesses brought against me, and to move Questions to your Lordships for their cross Examination, and likewise to produce my own Witnesses for discovery of the Truth.

And *Lastly*, That if there come any more Petitions of like Nature, that your Lordships would be pleased not to take any Prejudice or Apprehension of any Number or Muster of them, especially against a Judge, that makes two Thousand Orders and Decrees in a Year; not to speak of the Courses that have been taken for hunting out Complaints against me; but that I may answer them according to the rules of Justice severally and respectively. These requests I hope appear to your Lordships no other than just; and so thinking myself happy to have so Noble Peers, and Reverend Prelates to discern of my Cause and desiring no privilege of Greatness for subterfuge of Guiltiness, but meaning as I said to declare fairly and plainly with your Lordships, and to put myself upon your Honours and Favours. I pray God to bless your Council, and your Persons; and rest

Your Lordships  
Humblest Servant,

March 19th, 1620.

FRA. ST. ALBAN.



Upon which Letter, Answer was sent from the Lords unto the said Lord Chancellor on the said 20th March, viz. *That the Lords received his Lordship's Letter delivered unto them by the Lord Admiral: They intend to proceed in his Cause now before their Lordships, according to the right Rules of Justice; and they shall be glad, if his Lordship shall clear his Honour therein, to which end they pray his Lordship to provide for his just defence.*

And afterwards, on Wednesday the 21st of March, the Commons sent a Message unto the Lords concerning their further Complaint against the said Lord Chancellor; which consisted of these four Points, viz.

1. The First in Chancery being between the Lady Wharton, Plaintiff, and Wood and other Defendants, upon Cross-Bills; the Lord Chancellor upon hearing wholly dismissed them, but upon entry of the Order, the Cross-Bill against the Lady Wharton was only dismissed, and afterwards for a Bribe of 300l. given by the Lady Wharton to the Lord Chancellor, his Lordship decreed the Cause further; and then hearing that Wood and the other Defendants complained thereof to the House of Commons, his Lordship sent for them, and damned that Decree as unduly gotten; and when the Lady Wharton began to complain thereof, his Lordship sent for her also, and promis'd her Redress; saying, the Decree is not yet entered.

2. Secondly, In a suit between Hall, Plaintiff and Holman, Defendant, Holman deferring his Answer was committed to the Fleet, where he lay twenty Weeks; and petitioning to be delivered, was answered by some about the Lord Chancellor, the Bill shall be decreed against him (*pro confesso*) unless he would enter into 2000 l. Bond to stand to the Lord Chancellor's Order; which he refusing, his Liberty cost him one way or another one Thousand Pounds. Holman being freed out of the Fleet: Hall petition'd to the Lord Chancellor, and Holman finding his cause to go hard with him on his side, complained to the Commons; whereupon the Lord Chancellor sent for him, and to pacify him, told him, *He should have what Order he would himself.*

3. Thirdly. In the Cause between Smithwick and Welsh, the matter in question being for Accompts, it was referred to certain Merchants, who certified in behalf of Smithwick, yet Smithwick, to obtain a Decree, was told by one Mr. Burrough, one near to the Lord Chancellor, that it must cost him 200l., which he paid to Mr. Burrough or Mr. Hunt to the use of the Lord Chancellor, and yet the Lord Chancellor decreed but one part of the Certificate; whereupon he treats again with Mr. Burrough, who demanded another 100 l., which Smithwick also paid to the use of the Lord Chancellor. Then his Lordship referred the Accounts again to the same Merchants, who certified it again for Smithwick, yet his Lordship decreed the second part of the Certificate against Smithwick, and the first part, which was formerly decreed for him, his Lordship made doubtful. Smithwick petitioned to the Lord Chancellor for his Money again, and Smithwick had all his Money again save 20 l. which was kept back by Hunt for a Year.

The Lord Chief Justice\* also deliver'd three Petitions, which

---

\* Sir James Ley.

## 156 Interrogatories of Francis Bacon.

his Lordship receiv'd yesterday from the Commons, the first by the Lady *Wharton*, the second by *Wood* and others, and the third by *Smithwick*.

The *Fourth* part of the Message consists only of Instructions delivered unto the Commons by one *Churchil* a Register, concerning divers Bribes and Abuses in the Chancery, which the Commons desire may be examined.

The Lords in the meantime proceeded to the Examination of the Complaints, and took divers Examinations of Witnesses in the House, and appointed a select Committee of themselves, to take Examination of witnesses to the Briberies and Corruptions of the Lord Chancellor; which being ended and collected, were order'd to be transcribed with the Proofs, and were as follow:

That in the Cause between Sir <i>Rowland Egerton</i> and <i>Edward Egerton</i> , his Lordship received on the part of Sir <i>Rowland Egerton</i> before he decreed for him	1
<i>Item</i> , Of <i>Edward Egerton</i> in the said cause	300
<i>Item</i> , In the Cause between <i>Hodie</i> and <i>Hodie</i> , a dozen of Buttons (after the Cause ended) of the value of	400
<i>Item</i> , of Lady <i>Wharton</i>	50
<i>Item</i> , of Sir <i>Thomas Monk</i>	310
<i>Item</i> , of Sir <i>John Trevor</i>	100
<i>Item</i> , of one <i>Young</i>	100
<i>Item</i> , of one <i>Fisher</i>	100
<i>Item</i> , In the Cause of <i>Kenday</i> and <i>Valore</i> , of <i>Kenday</i> a Cabinet worth	106
Of <i>Valore</i> (borrow'd at two times)	800
<i>Item</i> , In the Cause between <i>Scot</i> and <i>Lenthall</i> , of <i>Scot</i>	2000
<i>Item</i> , Of <i>Lenthall</i>	200
<i>Item</i> , Of one <i>Wroth</i> , who had a Cause between him and one <i>Manwaring</i>	100
<i>Item</i> , Of Sir <i>Ralph Hansby</i>	500
<i>Item</i> , In the Lord <i>Mountaine's</i> Cause, of the Lord <i>Mountaine</i> , and more promis'd at the end of the Cause	600 or 700
<i>Item</i> , Of one Mr. <i>Dunch</i>	200
<i>Item</i> , In a Cause between <i>Reynell</i> and <i>Peacock</i> , 200 <i>l.</i> in Money, and a Diamond Ring worth 5 or 600 <i>l.</i>	700 or 800
<i>Item</i> , Of <i>Peacock</i>	100
<i>Item</i> , In a Cause of <i>Barker</i>	700
<i>Item</i> , There being a Reference from his Majesty to his Lordship of a Business between the Grocers and Apothecaries he had of the Grocers	200
Of the Apothecaries, (besides a rich Present of Amber-grease)	150
<i>Item</i> , Of the <i>French</i> Merchants, to constrain the Vintners of <i>London</i> to take 1500 Tuns of Wine; to accomplish which he used very indirect means, by colour of his Office and Authority, without Bill or other Suit depending, as threatening and imprisoning the Vintners, for which he receiv'd of the Merchants	1000
<i>Lastly</i> , That he had given way to great Exactions by his Servants, in respect of private Seals, and sealing injunctions.	

(To be continued).

## THE BACON SOCIETY'S ANNUAL DINNER.

The usual annual dinner to commemorate the birthday anniversary of Francis Bacon took place at the Criterion Restaurant, Piccadilly, on Monday, January 23rd. The new president, Mr. B. G. Theobald, B.A. (nephew to one of the original founders of the Society) presided. The Society's principal guests were Miss Mary Sturt and Mr. John Ritchie, M.A. Among others present were Mr. Percy Allen, the Lady Sydenham of Combe (who read a stirring communication from Lord Sydenham to "The Immortal Memory"), Sir T. C. Ferguson, Mr. Ernest Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Atkinson, Mr. J. B. Wells, B.Sc., the Rev. Scott, Miss Marjorie Bowen, and Mr. Carrington (*Herts. Advertiser*).

After the usual toast to His Majesty's health, Mr. Howard Bridgewater (barrister-at-law) proposed the health of the Society in felicitous terms and humorously suggested that the cause needed a famous advocate to give it the popularity it deserved, and thought Mr. Lloyd George might crown his career by vindicating it. Mr. Theobald responded eloquently and shewed the importance (which the Stratfordians always ignored) of the famous Northumberland Manuscript, a contemporary portfolio in which certain manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays and Bacon's manuscripts were found together, as well as their joint names.

Miss Mabel Sennett proposed the toast to the Ladies' Guild of Francis St. Alban in a very clear and concise manner, to which Miss Alicia A. Leith warmly responded. In proposing the toast to "The Visitors," Mr. C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A., staggered some of his hearers by producing a verbatim report of what actually happened at the Peacham "inquisition," for which Bacon had suffered unmerciful castigation by the "historical" hacks, as taking part in torture. The dreaded sentence, it turns out, was no more than he was to be *manacled*, and not "racked," as has been so infamously reported. Mr. Sylvain Mayer, K.C., responded, and a well-attended and successful meeting was brought to a close.

We owe thanks to the editors of the *Morning Post* (Jan. 24th), the *Islington Gazette* (Jan. 25th), and the *Herts. Advertiser* (Jan. 28th) for lengthy accounts of the occasion.

## REVIEWS.

REPORTS OF CASES DECIDED BY FRANCIS BACON, BARON VERULAM, VISCOUNT ST. ALBAN, LORD CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, in the High Court of Chancery (1617-1621). Prepared from the Records of that Court by JOHN RITCHIE, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. 302 pp. £2 2s. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd., 2 & 3, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.

This volume, beautifully bound, is a welcome addition, so to speak, of the works of Francis Bacon. It contains the principal of the Cases which came before him for adjudication during his office of Chancellor. The cases are preceded by a lengthy and learned preface by Mr. Ritchie. Although Bacon was one of England's greatest lawyers, as he points out, his cases had not been collated and published before, with the exception of notes concerning a few in Tothill's Reports. While he presided over the Court of Chancery his decisions were the main source of equity, jurisprudence and equity procedure, as well as 'the deliberate opinions of possibly the most ample intelligence that has been professionally concerned in the practice and administration of English law. "Not only is this the case, but "not a few of these decisions retain all their original importance determining as they do questions of legal principle or natural equity which might equally well arise at the present day." There are about 130 cases printed, with a copious index of names referred to,—John Donne, Lawrence, John, and George Washington; Sir Francis Drake; Sir Walter Raleigh; Oliver Cromwell; Richard, John, and William Shakespeare, the latter being a report of a dispute to a copyhold tenancy in Warwickshire, these brothers being weavers in the locality. After the suit had been decided, the plaintiff, William, commenced a suit in the Star Chamber against his brothers for perjury and for giving false evidence, but with what result does not transpire, as the decree therein *has not been preserved*. To the legal mind, in particular, this volume will be valued as a work of some distinction, while to the layman it will afford much interesting material and information which is otherwise to all intents and purposes inaccessible. It should find a place on every Baconian bookshelf, and the cases considered will go far to convince the reader of the emptiness of the allegation that Bacon's decisions were unjust, or that he had anything ever in his mind except strict equity as his rule and impartiality in its administration. It will be remembered that, at his 'fall,' he was charged with 'corruption' only by those *against* whose cases he had decided.

FRANCIS BACON: a biography. By MARY STURT. 246 pp. Cloth. Kegan Paul, French, Trubner & Co., Ltd., Broadway House, Carter Lane, London, E.C. 10s. 6d.

Modern biographies of Francis Bacon are somewhat rare, and the present volume, containing twelve good illustrations, is what may be described as a pocket edition of Spedding's monumental work.



It will appeal to those who have neither the opportunity nor the leisure to wade through the extended volumes of Spedding and Ellis. The authoress is a talented writer, and, exactly critical, but is always fair to Bacon's memory, whom she regards as a great and noble benefactor; and further, she is severe with Macaulay for his unjust and rhapsodical castigation of his 'faults' without any regard to the moral standards prevailing in Bacon's time. With regard to his 'fall,' she truly points out that he was condemned unheard, and explains much, with the aid of contemporary documents, to justify the opinion that he was more sinned against than sinning. But she regards Bacon only in the commonly viewed aspect as philosopher and man of affairs. In this, we are sorry to say that she is a little old-fashioned, for it is too late in the day to dismiss as chimerical the claim that Bacon was not only the creator of the great plays and poems of "William Shakespeare," but of much other important literature. To cite as a fair specimen of Bacon's attempt at poetry the psalms that he did whilst on a bed of sickness in his old age will count as nothing when we remember the eulogistic elegies which poured forth from the foremost scholars at his death, comparing him to the greatest poets of all time. For all that, we are grateful for Miss Sturt's contribution, for it will assist to break down the violent prejudice against Bacon's moral character which has been shamefully traduced by irresponsible partizans of the Stratford cult during the last century.

ENTER FRANCIS BACON (a sequel to "Exit Shakspeare"). By BERTRAM G. THEOBALD, B.A., Cecil Palmer, 49, Chandos St., London, W.C.2. 3s. net. 6d. postage.

One of the most useful little books for the beginner anxious to know the real case, or want of case, for Shakspeare of Stratford, as author of the great plays, was *Exit Shakspeare* noticed in the last issue. Here we have its natural sequel, in which the claim for Bacon's authorship of the plays is made out with skill and judgment. These two books should go hand in hand; and each strengthens the other. Mr. Theobald shows that the Stratford mummer's title as author was challenged in his own day, and that Marston and Hall knew perfectly well that Bacon was the real "Shakspeare," just as Ben Jonson knew, and caricatured the whole camouflage in more than one of his productions.

THE FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE. By EDWARD D. JOHNSON. London: Cecil Palmer, 1932. 5s. net.

Orthodox editors attribute the numerous mispaginations in the 1623 Folio to carelessness on the part of the printers; and not even the plausibility of Sir Sidney Lee as to the fact that *Troilus and Cressida* has a single leaf numbered, the remainder being blank, will suffice to provide a reasonable explanation of these so-called errors.

For many years past, Mr. Edward D. Johnson has been patiently working at this problem, and he has now published some of his findings. He discovers that all these apparent mistakes are parts of a system of cross references from the three sections of the volume, Comedies, Histories and Tragedies; and he shows by

copious examples that words or phrases found on exactly corresponding page numbers and line numbers in these sections will, when placed together, form intelligent and unmistakeable hints of the author's identity.

It is impossible to describe the system in a short review, but the book is stimulating and thought-provoking. We believe Mr. Johnson has unearthed yet another of the many methods invented by the nimble wit of Francis Bacon for conveying secret information to those who are endeavouring to track him to his lair. Under Mr. Johnson's guidance, the chase becomes both instructive and amusing, and we commend this little book to our readers. The selection published is only a small portion of his discoveries; but even so, it forms a striking piece of evidence.

'AS YOU LIKE IT': a new point of view. By MABEL SENNETT. Psychological Aid Society, 14, Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1. rs. 1d. post free.

Without attempting to discuss the authorship problem, Miss Sennett brings forward much sober and reflective thought in connection with the play, and those who are in the least degree versed in the subtleties of psychology will appreciate her keen sense of discrimination in the description of the several characters dominant in this Shakespearean life-drama. The average critic regards all such characterizations as types of men and women, all playing their respective rôles in some sort of unity of purpose; but here we have the method of symbolism brought into play, divining the whole drama itself as one human soul, the varying characters portrayed being but varying aspects of one inner consciousness. Those who have closely studied many of the characters in the great plays, have already become aware of the author's design of embodying the principle of composite characterization in his dramatic puppets, which has been regarded as a species of camouflage, but Miss Sennett thinks that the method is an essential factor to a right understanding of the emotional antinomies involved. The idiosyncracies of temperament which we label character are a wonderfully complex affair. That each one of us is part man and part woman, and part ancestral on both sides into the bargain, is a commonplace of psychology. Our readers should read and digest Miss Sennett's praiseworthy effort in a new direction.

BACON V. SHAKESPEARE. By "Antonio." London: Bacon Society, Canonbury Tower, N.1. 6d.

This excellent little pamphlet will interest those who have hitherto heard little of the famous controversy, but who are sufficiently broad-minded to approach a knowledge of the subject without prejudice. The frontispiece portrait of Shakespeare behind a mask which appears in the First Folio is reproduced in *facsimile*, as well as two complete pages from "Love's Labours Lost," which contain cryptograms pointing to Bacon as the true author. The author expounds the meaning of the Latin references therein. There are also some striking excerpts from the celebrated *Manes Verulamiana*—that chorus of elegies penned by eminent scholars at Bacon's death, revealing him as the true Shakespeare—"the tenth Muse."—"Apollo must now be content with mine Muses."

SPHINX: Revue Mensuelle des Questions Récréatives. 75, Rue Philippe Bancq, Bruxelles.

We have received a copy of No. 9 (Sept. 1932) of the above interesting publication, in which our Associate, M. van Esbroecke, has a cryptographic article in a prominent position, shewing a variation of Bacon's Biliteral Cypher by the use of numerals 1 and 2, instead of the alphabetical letter symbols, *a* and *b*. An excellent way to introduce Baconian cryptography to new readers and in a new sphere of activity.

---

#### IMPORTANT DISCOVERY AT VERULAMIUM.

Among last year's discoveries at Verulamium, the Roman city near St. Albans, Hertfordshire, is a fragment of a cooking pot to which archæologists attach great importance.

On the side of the fragment are the four letters CUNO and the fragment of a B. These letters are believed to be one of the few clues that help to confirm the legend of Cunobeline, son of Cassovalaunus, who defended Verulamium against the Romans.

Mrs. R. E. M. Mortimer Wheeler, who is superintending the excavations for her husband, Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, Keeper of the London Museum, stated: "Cunobeline is, as is well known, Cymbeline, the hero of Shakespeare's play. So far we have not found anything definite about him. It is cheering to have this little bit of pottery with his name on, for it shows at least that the legend of Cunobeline was known at Verulamium even in the second century."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF *BACONIANA*.

Sirs,—In *BACONIANA*, December, 1929, Mr. W. G. C. Gundry gives, in "*A Cypher Triad*," three cryptograms disclosing Bacon's name in "*Twelfth Night*," "*Hamlet*," and "*Two Gentlemen of Verona*." In each case some suggestion of a wheel, or of revolving, was indicated. I therefore thought of applying the same method to the curious word *DUCDAME* in "*As you Like It*," which is said to be "*A Greek invocation to call fools into a circle*." In Jaques' song the word is repeated three times, and three revolutions of the circle are all that is needed to produce the acrostic cryptogram, *F. BACON*, as follows:—

DUCDAME  
EWDEBNF  
FXEFCOG

Yours truly,  
M. SENNETT.

---

### THE "PLAYFAIR" CYPHER.

TO THE EDITORS OF *BACONIANA*.

Sirs,—My attention has been called to your excellent magazine, from enquiries, by some letters in the *Morning Post*, a correspondent seeking particulars of the above cipher, and Mr. Henry Seymour's reply to the effect that it was of the "substitutional" variety, worked by a key-word, and used extensively for military purposes. I am encouraged to ask if you could possibly find space for a fuller explanation, or a practical example. I understand that it is a cipher impossible to break without the possession of the key-word used (which may be varied *ad lib*), and if so, it must be the ideal type so long sought by interested experts.

Yours truly,  
W. WALLIS.

[We usually only discuss ciphers in *BACONIANA* as have reference to our special subject, and those devised or used (or so alleged) by Bacon himself in his writings. The rule may be relaxed in the present case as a courtesy.]

In the first place, you mark out a square, divided into twenty-five smaller squares within the whole square. Select any key-word you please, but only such as has not two of the same letters repeated. Suppose the word "*Palindrome*." You then distribute its letters in their sequential order along the first and third, or fourth, lines of the square, within the smaller square compartments. After that, you fill in the remaining squares, in due sequential order, the other letters which compose the regular alphabet,



always remembering that I and J are as one and interchangeable. An illustration of such a filled-out square will best make this clear.

*	P	A	L	F	N
	B	C	F	G	H
	K	Q	S	T	U
*	D	R	O	M	E
	V	W	X	Y	Z

Now, suppose you wish to secrete the words—Playfair Cypher. Divide them into pairs of letters, thus: PL AY FA IR CY PH ER. Then each pair of letters will be substituted for another by following the rules set out hereunder.

(1) When each pair of letters happen to fall in the same *vertical* column, then their correct substitutional letters will be the next letters falling immediately beneath them respectively. But when any letter is in the lowest square, the top letter of the same column becomes its substitutional one.

(2) When each pair of letters falls in the same *horizontal* line, their substitutes will be those (on the same principle) immediately following them, and when either letter is at the end of a line, the substitutional letter will be the first letter of the same line.

(3) When any other pair of letters does not fall either in one vertical column or one horizontal line, then this pair is to be regarded as opposite corners of a rectangle formed within the area of the smaller squares involved, the letters at the other corners of the said square being those to be substituted.

(4) When an uneven number of letters occur in a message, always add X or Z as a final letter to complete the pairs. When two like letters occur together, as *ee* in *seen* or *ll* in *well*, it is usual to insert the letter X or Z between them, as this cypher is detected by the association of *bigraphs*, rather than by the ordinary clue of individual letter-frequencies.

By applying the words "Playfair Cypher" to the square by the foregoing rules—the substitutional letters will be AI for PL (rule 2); IW for AY (rule 3); CL for FA (Rule 3); AM for IR (rule 3); GW for CY (rule 3); NB for PH (rule 3); and DO for ER (rule 2). These substituted letters, AIIWCLAMGWNBD O, will constitute the cryptogram, and in messages of any length they are set out in rows of, say, five, and in columns, the easier to avoid errors.

This is the "Playfair" cypher, but it cannot be regarded as absolutely unbreakable without the key. It is, in fact, a rather elementary one, consisting only of keywords varying the substitutes of normal letters, and as such may be decoded by experts, by patient analysis, and by a scientific classification of the groups, or pairs, given sufficient length to make classification possible.

To conclude, here is a further short example with the same keyword, the words enclosed being what the military general Napoleon

might appropriately have inscribed. It is left for our readers to decode.

P	C	N	O	A
C	T	L	D	O
M	N	Q	L	Z
R	P	F	L	W

Ignore the grouping and divide each consecutive pair of letters, pc, no, ac, etc., and find their significant, in reverse, in accordance with the foregoing rules.—HENRY SEYMOUR.]

### GULLIVER'S TRAVELS.

TO THE EDITORS OF BACONIANA.

Dear Sirs,—May I draw the attention of those of your readers who are interested in Numerical Ciphers to the title page of the 1st Edition of "Gulliver's Travels," now in the British Museum. It will be found on investigation to be full of affirmations of Bacon's authorship. The last word 'ships,' printed noticeably in capitals, also bears the signature of the author.

Yours truly,  
R. L. HEINIG.

### ACROSTIC SIGNATURES.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Sirs,—I have read several articles in BACONIANA and elsewhere on the acrostic signatures of Francis Bacon in *Richard II*, *The Tempest*, etc., but, owing to the lack of anything of the kind associated with Francis Bacon personally, the writers refer us to Colonna, Ben Jonson's acrostic verse on Margaret Ratcliffe, *Volpone*, and so on, in support. The following, however, is a little nearer home, and it is certain that Francis Bacon saw it, although it is on the name of his brother. This "courtly trifle" is at Lambeth (undated) under date 1594-6, in volume 653, folio 159.

Poeme compose d'un artifice nouveau sur le nom e surnom du Seigneur Anthoine Bacon.

A nglois phenix de celeste origine,  
N é pour orner e la terre, e les cieulx,  
T on renom bruit iusques aux enuieux :  
H onneur te sert e vertu te domine :  
O rnement seul de sagesse e doctrine,  
I our, e clairté de tout cœur genereux :  
N ous ne scaurions regarder de nos yeux  
E ternité qui deuant toy chemine.

Bacone.

B acon fior di vertu, raro e perfetto  
A nimo pronto, angelico intelletto  
C hiaro lume d'honor e cartide  
O rnameto e belta di nostra etade  
N atural real di fidelta pieno  
E ssempio d'ogni ben sempre sereno.

Yours truly,  
W.H.D.

## NOTES AND NOTICES.

It is with sorrow that we have to record the deaths of three of our good members since the issue of the last number—Brig.-General S. A. E. Hickson, Mr. Joseph Hyder, the protagonist of Land Reform, who was associated with the late Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, and our Vice-President, Mrs. Crouch Batchelor, after a painful illness. May they now rest in peace.

---

Dr. Frank Lowry Clark and Mrs. Natalie Rice Clark honoured us with a second visit to Canonbury Tower on 4th August last, when a number of members greeted them and took occasion to profit by Mrs. Clark's convincing exposition of the Dial and Compass Cypher, discovered by her, and in its application to the play of Hamlet, revealing how minutely and ingeniously Francis Bacon was to be identified as Hamlet, so corroborative of the prevailing opinion that *Hamlet* is mainly autobiographical. Readers will remember that we gave a brief notice of her latest book on this subject in our last issue. It is not a study for the superficial investigator into Bacon's secrets, but it contains a rare wealth of learning and research for those who are able to delve beneath the surface of the exterior play.

---

There is a curious parallel between the lives of Shakspeare and of Ludwig Holberg, as well as between the latter and Francis Bacon, in this respect, that after having provided a number of philosophical works, he convulsed Copenhagen with comedies under the pseudonym of a non-existent actor! His identity was afterwards revealed, as there was no very special reason to maintain secrecy. Students should look this up.

---

The contribution by Mr. Denning, in the present issue, carries the argument of parallelisms of thought and diction in the works of Bacon and "Shakespeare" a step farther. If the allusions in the letters of Lady Anne Bacon to their counterpart expressions in certain of the Shakespeare writings hold good—as they certainly appear to be curiously co-related—we may be rambling back to the early and prosaic experiences in Bacon's life, which possibly furnished the inspiration and raw material out of which was born the immortal imagery of his pen—the vulgar dross, so to speak, from which his golden eloquence was extracted. The thesis of Mr. Denning demands attentive thought and reflection. He has brought a new factor to bear on the great problem.

---

Amongst a number of Bacon manuscripts from the Redgrave Muniments which fell into the market in 1923, was a bond of T. *Fastolfe*, witnessed by George and John Bacon in 1556, while another parchment document of some thirty years later by Nicholas Bacon accepts as a tenant one *Bardolf*, who appears as a friend of the former in the Plays. I recommended the late Lady Durning-Lawrence to purchase these, which I think she did, and added to

the famous library collected by Sir Edwin. They should figure in the gift of books bequeathed by Lady Durning-Lawrence to the London University.

---

In Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of Shakespeare* it is said that "Shakespeare in both parts of *Henry IV* originally named the chief of the prince's associates after Sir John Oldcastle, a character in the old play. But Henry Brooke, eighth Lord Cobham, who succeeded to the title early in 1597, and claimed descent from the historical Sir John Oldcastle, the Lollard leader, raised objection; and when the first part of the play was printed . . . in 1598 ('newly corrected' in 1599), Shakespeare bestowed on Prince Hal's tun-bellied follower the new and deathless name of Falstaff. A trustworthy edition of the second part of *Henry IV* also appeared with Falstaff's name substituted for that of Oldcastle in 1600. There the epilogue expressly denied that Falstaff had any characteristic in common with the martyr Oldcastle. Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man. But the substitution of the name Falstaff did not pass without protest. It hazily recalled Sir John *Fastolf*, an historical warrior who had already figured in *Henry VI* and was owner at one time of the Boar's Head Tavern in Southwark."

---

Oldys says that the Fastolfs "were descended from an ancient and famous English family in Norfolk." The Bacons were related to them. Thomas Fastolf, son and heir of John Fastolf, of Pettan, Suffolk, married Alice, daughter of John Bacon, Esq., of Hesselst, Suffolk. They had issue four sons and five daughters.

---

The report of the Library Committee for the London University was published last year, in which a large number of the extremely rare and valuable books in this gift was set out. There were nearly 6,000 volumes in all. Some stir was made in literary circles (vide *Times Literary Supplement*, 25th February, 1932) when Professor Allardyce Nicoll wrote a two-column article to call attention to a remarkable MS. copy of two addresses read before the Ipswich Philosophic Society, 1803-5, by James Corton Cowell, in which Bacon was first suspected of being the author of "Shakespeare." The article by the Lord Sydenham of Combe in this issue has special reference to this recent discovery.

---

With the present issue, a Supplement entitled "An Appeal for Justice" is presented, which it is hoped may do somewhat to nail down the exaggerated misstatements that have so long been current respecting Francis Bacon's alleged moral turpitude. These leaflets may be obtained from the Society in bulk at 2s. 6d. per 100, so that any interested may distribute them judiciously abroad, by way of propaganda.

---

Mr. Clifford Bax, the playwright, suggested at a meeting of the British Empire Shakespeare Society in London that someone should have the courage to re-write some of the difficult passages of Shakespeare and put them in simple language, so that everyone can understand them. "Something must be done to keep our end up—we are always being told with some justice that other nations



shew more enthusiasm for Shakespeare than we do—and it would be better than producing Shakespeare in modern clothes, making it look like a rehearsal before the costumes had arrived."

Princess Marie Louise, who distributed the prizes, timely remarked: "It will be a very, very brave man indeed who will dare to re-write Shakespeare. I do not know how one would dare to alter one letter, even if one does not understand him. Perhaps it is one of the attractions in him that there is always something to learn and find out."

The Council begs to acknowledge some gifts of books to the Library. From Miss Dora Durning-Lawrence, remainders of the editions of "Bacon is Shakespeare," "The Northumberland Manuscript," "Queen Elizabeth, Amy Robsart and the Earl of Leicester," and sundry smaller books and manuscripts; from Mr. A. G. Moffat, a rare copy of "I Ragguagli di Parnasso," by Trajano Boccalini, translated into English by the Right Hon. Henry, Earl of Monmouth, MDCLXIX.; from Mrs. Arnold C. Stuart, a nice copy of Sir Rt. le Grys' translation of John Barclay's "Argenis" (with Clavis), London, 1629, and from Dr. Cook, a *facsimile* copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare.

The last Annual Meeting of Members took place at Canonbury Tower on March 3rd, 1932, to receive the Society's accounts and balance sheet for 1931, and to elect new officers and Council for the period March, 1932—March, 1933. As all members were posted with particulars there is no need to add more than the accounts were adopted unanimously. In the election of officers, Mr. Bertram G. Theobald, B.A., was chosen President; The Lady Sydenham of Combe, The Dowager Lady Boyle, Mrs. Crouch Batchelor, Miss Alicia A. Leith, Mr. Harold Bayley, Mr. Frank Woodward and Mr. Horace Nickson were elected Vice-Presidents. Mr. Howard Bridgewater was elected as Chairman of the Council, and Mrs. Arnold C. Stuart as Vice-Chair. Mr. H. Seymour was re-elected Hon. Treasurer (and accepted *pro tem*) and also Hon. Secretary. The Council elected consisted of Mrs. V. Bayley, Miss M. Sennett, Miss M. Plarr, Mr. W. H. Denning, Mr. Lansdown Goldsworthy, Mr. Percy Walters, Mr. C. Y. C. Dawbarn, Mr. Parker Brewis and Mr. H. Seymour. Mr. G. L. Emmerson, A.C.I.S., F.L.A.A., was unanimously re-elected as the Society's auditor.

The next Annual Meeting will take place at Canonbury Tower on March 2nd this year, at 7-30 p.m., followed at 8-30 p.m. by a *Conversations* for Members and friends whom members may like to introduce.

In the last number we referred to Miss Annette Covington's remarkable discovery of Francis Bacon's name camouflaged in the flourishing around the initial letter B which is the first letter of the text of *The Tempest* in the First Folio. In the same number we referred to a later discovery by Miss Covington, in which she found much more than the mere name, to wit, a veritable picture gallery wrapped in the same, of the profiles or figures of Henry VIII,

Anne Boleyn, Bacon, Essex, Margaret de Valois, and other notable personages. We promised to deal with these in the present issue, but we received a letter from Miss Covington, declaring that the initial letter B with its decoration, as printed in our last, was somewhat different to that in her own possession, and from which she extracted her sketches, which have fully appeared in the *Cincinnati Times Star* during last year, at frequent intervals. The reproduction which is from her copy and which she has sent to me certainly reveals some differences. I compared the block I had prepared for the last issue with the letter in the several copies of the First Folio at the British Museum, and not noticing the least difference, I assumed it to be the same. But it evidently is not. The matter must therefore await further investigation.

To those familiar with Bacon and Shakespeare literary productions it will be known that they were mostly printed in duplicate (with differences) under the same edition. In the case of Bacon's *Henry VII*, I have seen no fewer than *five* differing copies (differing in this case in the forms of italic letters), although issued under the same date (1622). I have also seen *two* differing copies of the *First Folio* title page, which reminds me of what the late Mrs. Pott once discovered in a publisher's office—that the "official" copy of a certain History of Freemasonry contained much more information than the edition issued for ordinary public consumption.

Few Baconians believe that Francis Bacon died on the 9th day of April in the year 1626. There is no available evidence, beyond hearsay, of such an event, if we except the direct testimony of Dr. Rawley, that he did die on that date, and was buried at Gorham-bury, where, in the words of Bacon's will, the testator expressed a desire to be buried with his "mother." There is no evidence that either Bacon or Lady Anne was buried at Gorham-bury. The old Earl of Verulam had the Crypt examined some years ago to ascertain the truth of this assertion, but the evidence was plainly negative. The burial registers of the time are also significantly missing. Dr. Krisch (said to have been the last of the Rosicrucians in Germany) informed the late Mrs. Pott that Bacon really died in the year 1668, a centenarian. There is a curious register of burial of a "Francis Bacon" at St. Martin-in-the-Fields (where Francis Bacon's baptism was registered), under the date 27th Sept. 1663! If this should, by any chance, turn out to be the burial registration of our Francis Bacon, then it is significant that the spelling of his surname (the same as that on the "Bacon" passports) should, together with his Christian name, count up to the numerical total (in simple cypher) of 103, which also equals the name of "Shakespeare," and which, furthermore, makes out that he was precisely 103 years of age when he died!

The Rt. Hon. John Mackinnon Robertson, P.C., the well-known author and former M.P. and one-time junior Minister, died last month in London, after a distinguished career. He was Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade from 1911 to 1915. Although Baconians had some differences of opinion with him on the subject of Bacon *versus* Shakespeare, it will be conceded that

he was honest in his convictions, and was far more scholarly and industrious than many of his contemporary literary critics whose names will be happily forgotten in the next generation.

There is a type of imbecile abroad that, whenever the possibility of a country clown having written our greatest works in English literature is questioned, invariably falls back on the subterfuge that *genius* made that possible. It does not attempt to advance a scrap of evidence that Billy Shakspeare had any genius. Oh, dear no. That has to be taken for granted. Nor, indeed, is any attempt made to define what is meant by this blessed word *genius*. It entirely overlooks, and trusts that its casual readers will likewise overlook, the patent fact that all the genius in the world could never have produced the Great Plays. It required something more than genius—it required uncommon knowledge and exceptional education to do that, as well as the application of the faculty for taking infinite pains to put that knowledge and education to good account.

The article by Lord Sydenham in the present issue is being re-printed as a propaganda pamphlet, and may be obtained from the Bacon Society at 1½d., post free. The article, also, by Mr. Denning is being issued as a pamphlet, which can be supplied at 6d. per copy, post free.

We regret that we are obliged to hold over a reply to Mr. Hammond by Mr. Howard, referring further to the Chepstow excavations. Our space is so limited that we are obliged to give precedence to manuscripts which have long been waiting for publication.

That Francis Bacon was indebted largely to Bernard Palissy (the Potter), referred to in the "English Renaissance" herein, for many of his early opinions in philosophy and natural science, there can be small doubt.\* I have not found that Francis attended the famous lectures of Palissy at Paris, when he was there in his teens, but he probably did, for his associates, the brothers *Jacques* and *Pierre* Primaudaye certainly did, as Palissy himself has recorded, the latter being the ascribed author of *The French Academy* which was "translated" and brought out in English in 1586. Moreover, in the list of distinguished notabilities which Palissy states were his regular auditors, he particularly mentions that there were also a few noble persons who attended *incognito*. It is a moot point whether Bacon chose his famous pseudonym from the suggestion of the joint Christian names of the Primaudayes in 1593, and allowed it (for different reasons) to become confused with a differently spelt but similar sounding name in 1598, to camouflage the real authorship of the "treasonable" *Richard II*.

Miss Annette Covington has a strong suspicion that the poetic works of Robert Herrick are in reality those of Bacon. She has made a comparative study of them and there are other features

---

\*Allusion to Palissy's "little Academy" in *Love's Labours Lost*.

which appeal to her as Baconian. "To students," she says, "I recommend witch references in Shakespeare and Herrick's 'The Hag,' noticing 'Thorough brakes and thorough bryars,' and 'Through bush, through brier' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. . . . Study Herrick's 'Mad Mayde's Song' with its 'who with green turfs rears his head' and turn to *Hamlet*, 'At his head a grass green turf,' and read Herrick's *Eternitie*." Herrick was born 1591 and died in 1674. He studied law at Trinity, Cambridge, in 1616. In 1629 he accepted the living at Dean Prior, Devonshire. In 1647 he was ejected for his royalist principles and went to London, but was restored in 1662. He published in 1648 "*Hesperides*, or the Works both Human and Divine."

We have received, as we go to press, No. 8 of the third year, the *Deutsche Baconiana*, the organ of the German Bacon-Shakespeare Society. It contains two excellent photographic illustrations, one of Queen Elizabeth at the age of 20, and the other of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, besides much interesting reading matter, mostly by Herr Ludwig Mathy. Address: Rohrbacher Str. 50, Heidelberg.

Doris Langley Moore has written a biography of "E. Nesbit," the authoress, and writer of the best Shakespeare story-book for children in the English language. (Benn, 15s.). It will be remembered that "E. Nesbit" was, during her later years, a member of the Bacon Society and occasional contributor to *BACONIANA*. She was better known as Mrs. E. N. Bland-Tucker, having been married twice, firstly to Mr. Hubert Bland (one of the founders of the Fabian Society) and after his decease, to Captain Tucker, with both of whom I was personally acquainted. Her death was noticed in *BACONIANA*, Sept., 1924.

Our readers will share our pain on hearing of the death, at 81, of the famous author, Mr. George Moore. He was admittedly the best English prose writer of his time. Like Francis Bacon, in more than one respect, he spent his early years in Paris as an art student, becoming inspired by the French outlook on literary fiction. Flaubert was his idol, and at the age of 33, he returned to England "as a troubadour to revolutionize English literature." He criticised his brother English novelists for not taking sufficient pains in revising their work. As in Bacon's case, his own writings suffered revision after revision until they conformed to his own high standard. When he was taken ill some three or four years ago, Sir James M. Barrie helped him to publish his notable contribution to the Baconian claim to the authorship of "Shakespeare," *The Making of an Immortal*, which was soon after produced by Mr. Robert Atkins at the Arts Club Theatre to full and appreciative audiences. Mr. Moore will continue to live in his works, and Baconians will cherish his memory.

H.S.



## OBITUARY.

It is a sad duty imposed on me to record the death, in December 16th last, of our talented and noble-minded member, Mrs. Natalie Rice Clark, of Oxford, Ohio, U.S.A. The news reached us with a painful shock, after her comparatively recent visit to Canonbury last August. Her devoted husband, Professor Frank Lowry Clark, of Miami University, has sent me some particulars of Mrs. Clark's life. She was born on December 20th, 1867, at Danvers, Mass., U.S.A., and was the daughter of the Rev. Charles Baker and Claire Austin Rice. She was descended from the Pilgrim Fathers of 1620, and her father was for more than thirty years pastor of the Ancient Church in which the Salem witchcraft broke out.

Mrs. Clark was educated in the public schools of her native town, and in the Massachusetts Normal Art School of Boston. She early developed an interest in authorship as well as art and became assistant editor of "Littell's Living Age," of Boston. She was the authoress of two story books for young people, "The Green Garnet" (Boston, 1896) and "Blake Redding" (Boston, 1903).

Partly through the influence of the poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, whom she knew well in her early life, and partly through her own studies, she became a strong advocate of the Baconian authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare. Her first book dealing with this subject was entitled "Bacon's Dial in Shakespeare" (Steward Kidd, Cincinnati, 1922). Following her discovery of the Dial, which she constructed inductively from her personal study

of the writings of Francis Bacon, and then found verified in all the plays of the First Folio of 1623, Mrs. Clark got into communication with other Baconians in America and Europe, organized the Oxford branch of the Bacon Society of America, lectured on the Dial in New York and Boston and other places, and carried on an extensive correspondence. After years of scholarly and painstaking research, she brought out in 1931 her second Baconian book, "Hamlet on the Dial Stage" (Champion, Paris, 1931), in which she made use of a further development of the Dial and of the device of puppets on the Dial stage.

She lectured before the London Bacon Society at Canonbury in September, 1929, and again, when she visited England last summer.

At the time of her death she was engaged upon a simplified treatment of Hamlet on the Dial Stage for school use.

Mrs. Clark is survived by her husband, Professor Clark, a sister, Mrs. Frank Foxcroft, and a brother, Rev. Austin Rice, D.D., of Wakefield, Massachusetts. The immediate cause of Mrs. Clark's death was medically diagnosed as cerebral hemorrhage. She had suffered from heart trouble for years, at irregular intervals, from which she rallied, but the last attack was accompanied by her passing into a state of coma and unconsciousness two days before her death, from which she never roused. The funeral obsequies took place on December 19th, at Oxford, and Mrs. Clark's body rests by the side of that of her beloved son, Ransom, who died in France, in the years of unhappy memory.

*Requiescat in Pace.*

H.S.



